

मेरुपुस्तकालय पुरोहित पुस्तकालय
वनस्थली विद्यापीठ

श्रेणी संख्या.....954:5.0041.....

पुस्तक संख्या.....A 11K.....

आवृत्ति क्रमांक.....10912.....

LETTERS TO AN INDIAN RAJA,

FROM

A POLITICAL RECLUSE:

REPRINTED AFTER REVISION FROM THE "INDIAN SPECTATOR."

PRINTED AT THE "TATVA-VIVECHAKA" PRESS,

BOMBAY.

1891.

Price one Rupee or two Shillings.

*[Registered under Act XXV of 1867, and copyright and
right of translation reserved.]*

DEDICATED

TO

THE RULING PRINCES AND CHIEFS OF INDIA ;

WITH THE BEST WISHES


FOR

Their welfare, the integrity of their
power and the prosperity
of their states:

BY

Their humble and earnest well-wisher,

THE AUTHOR.



NOTICE.

The Native States of India form an appreciable portion of the country and of its population, and enjoy complete protection against external aggression and internal troubles from the Paramount Power. If, in these circumstances, they were to imbibe at least the elements of a progressive spirit of which that Power furnishes abundant example, they would not only ensure their own welfare, but might re-act beneficially on British India in some important respects and thus serve to aid the general advancement of the country. How this could be effected and what difficulties exist in its way is an important question, and it was to invite attention to that question that these Letters were primarily taken in hand. They have now been issued in a permanent form, because, when shown to a few friends eminently qualified to pass an opinion thereon, they elicited cordial approval. It was also reported to the writer from a reliable source that a very favourable opinion of the Letters had been pronounced in certain high quarters in Native Territory; and when informed of their intended republication, Sir W. W. Hunter, K. C. S. I., C. I. E., whose name carries such deserved weight and who has done so much to familiarize the British public with the more important of our popular movements, was good enough to furnish an Introduction which will speak for itself.

All the Letters have been carefully revised and improved since they first appeared in the *Indian Spectator* in the course of 1889-90, and Letter No. II,

which was originally written under a disadvantage, has, besides, been largely added to, by expansion of the argument with the help of a friend who has made the subject his special study.

The author, mainly for personal reasons, withholds his name and leaves this little brochure to be judged on its own merits.

October, 1891.

THE AUTHOR.

INTRODUCTION.

I read with interest the series of LETTERS TO AN INDIAN RAJA, by a Political Recluse, as they appeared from week to week in the *Indian Spectator*, and I have now much pleasure in writing a few words by way of introduction to them in their collected form. It is not necessary that I should express my entire concurrence with the author upon all the important questions with which he deals. It is sufficient for me to state my belief that they form a valuable contribution to Indian political knowledge, and that they will be read with profit not only by the Feudatory Rájás, to whom they were addressed, but by all serious thinkers in British India on the great subjects of which they treat.

The writer is, I regret to say, personally unknown to me. He is, I believe, exactly what he signs himself, a Political Recluse, who after a life of practical acquaintance with the problems with which he deals, has now devoted a strict retirement to recording the conclusions at which he has arrived. His views are the result of actual experience in the administration of a Native State. That practical experience has led him to take up a position half-way between the old school of Indian thinkers, who would let things rest as they are, and the new school who would like to see everything changed within a single generation. I confess that his attitude of moderation strongly commends itself to my mind, and it is because I believe this attitude is the wisest one for Indian reformers at the present moment, that (without endorsing all their

views) I commend the following Letters to the perusal of thoughtful men, alike in India and England.

The Political Recluse brings to his task a knowledge of administration, obtained both in the British and Native territories, such as few men now possess. As an educational officer in the Western Presidency, and for some years in the Secretariat, he had the opportunity of thoroughly studying our British departmental methods. To this he joins reminiscences in early life of indiginous rule in a small principality, and experience as a judicial officer, in a position of trust, in an important Native State. His political views may possibly be found tinged with a spirit of pessimism, consequent on the grave defects in administration which have come under his notice; and with a certain despondency, arising out of the inconsistent lines pursued by some of his countrymen with regard to political and social progress. The religious views expressed in these Letters have also a deep interest for those who desire to gain insight into the inner spiritual life of a cultivated Indian thinker of the present day.

To the Feudatory Chiefs of India, these Letters, addressed to a typical Maharájá, ought to prove of great value. The writer advises them in the capacity of a candid friend: but as a friend who is sensitive for their honour, and who earnestly desires to uphold the integrity of their power. If his counsels in regard to the internal administration of a Native State and with reference to the relations which should be maintained by a Native State with neighbouring Feudatory Princes and with the British Power, are

laid to heart by any young Mahárájá, that Mahárájá might make his territories a model State in India. Not the least valuable section of his work is directed to the establishment of a sounder connection between the Darbar of such a State and the accredited Agents of the Government of India. Here, too, the writer speaks from personal knowledge; and his views, whether accepted in their entirety or not, are worthy of careful attention by our own Political Department, not less than by the Feudatory Chiefs.

I need only add that in their present permanent form, the Letters could not be more appropriately dedicated than to the Princes and Chiefs of India. The Editor and Proprietor of the *Indian Spectator*, the journal in which they originally appeared, has won for himself a unique position of usefulness, standing as he does between the peoples and princes of India on the one hand, and between the more conservative and the more advanced political schools of Native thought on the other. Mr. Malabari's visit to England last year, made independently of any Congress or other organisation, but simply in the interests of Indian social reform, has proved in a conspicuous manner how great may be the results of one man's self-devotion to a righteous cause. It is no small advantage to these Letters that they go forth under such auspices.

W. W. HUNTER.

LETTERS TO AN INDIAN RAJA,

FROM

A POLITICAL RECLUSE.

To

HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA G — G —

C. K., S. B., &c., &c., &c.,

RAJA OF THE STATE OF G—

Letter No. I.

MAHARAJA,—

It is now some time since, by the grace of God, the King of Kings, and by the kindness of the British Government, the Paramount Power in the land, you have completed your minority and your education and ascended the throne of your ancestors; and you have already given proofs of becoming a capable Ruler and virtuous Prince, and, therefore, an ornament to your house and your class, a source of happiness to your State and its people, and of pleasure and satisfaction to the paramount British Government. It is now the main business of your life to advance the welfare of your people and to maintain intact your engagements with the Superior Government. These two objects happily are not inconsistent with each other; but the Native States of India are just now passing through a critical period of their existence: their present fortunes are as different from the past as the future promise or threaten to be from the present, and these will be a great deal determined by the conduct of their own rulers and administrators during this critical period. Their task, indeed, even in the case of an unbroken succession of capable princes on the *gadi* and of worthy statesmen at the helm of affairs—a contingency which it is not possible to

secure under any circumstances—is far from an easy one amidst their peculiar surroundings and the harassing difficulties of their situation ; while in the case of a break in such succession, which is the rule as continuity is the exception, the difficulty of that task must often become phenomenal. I need not stop to specify these difficulties, as indeed, I fancy, they already have commenced to offer themselves daily before your eyes in your dealings, on the one hand, with your hereditary nobility, the official hierarchy from the highest to the lowest, and the great body of your subjects; and, on the other, in your relations to the representative at your Court of the British Government which is enlightened, all-powerful and ever-progressive—characteristics which lead it, in dealing with ignorant, backward and feeble races and administrations sometimes to disregard, (and indeed on occasions at least in view of larger interests it cannot help disregarding) the claims of right and to prefer expediency to justice, as must happen with human agents exercising for the time power that is simply irresistible.

Under such circumstances I desire very much to communicate to your Highness a few suggestions which occur to me from my experience and observation of public life in Native States and in British India, and I shall be very glad if they should prove of the slightest service to you, and tend to any the smallest advantage or good to yourself or to your State. Before entering on the suggestions I have in view, however, I wish to answer one or two preliminary questions which will naturally occur to you, and a reply to which is essential to a clear comprehension of the object with which I am thus obtruding upon your Highness's attention, as also on your valuable time.

The first question then would perhaps be—Why do I address your Highness above all other Rajas or Nababs in the country? Well, the reply is that you are the representative—and many circumstances have tended to make you a worthy and promising representative—of your class. To begin with, you not only have been generously endowed by your Maker with a sound mind and a feeling heart, but you have also re-

ceived, through the kindness of the Paramount Power, a good education, such as falls to the lot of very few Rajas or sons of Rajas; and what lends its special value to your education and to your natural gifts and graces is the salutary nature of your surroundings, *antecedent to your accession to your throne*, and consequently of the conditions under which the education for that exalted position was imparted to you. For, though an undoubtedly lineal and rightful off-shoot of the ruling stock planted on the soil of G——by the valour of——and nourished by the courage and wisdom of——you were born and bred up in early boyhood *as a subject*, and there is for the purpose of my essay a world of high moral significance in these three short words I have underlined, as you may easily realize by reflection and observation. Being born outside the ruling branch of your house, you and your natural parents and brethren have known what it is to be a subject and a taxpayer, and now you have in the providential order of things attained to the high and onerous privilege of a spender of the taxes and a ruler of men, with power over their lives and fortunes. You are, therefore, better qualified to appreciate the sacred duties and responsibilities of that position than even pettier princes, born and brought up amidst enervating and demoralising influences and nourished in the intoxicating and dementing exercise of absolute and irresponsible power from their infancy within their small domains. You, in fact, occupy an enviable position which belonged to none of your predecessors, and which will not fall to the lot of any of your successors on the *gadi*. Indeed, your position is unique. At a College examination in an advanced class there was once set this theme for an essay—"What measures would you adopt if you were made Governor-General in British India?" You may well imagine with what ardour the cleverest and most ambitious of the students revelled in dreams of a wise administration and philanthropic statesmanship—for the ambition of youth is naturally noble; and, when acted on by a sound education, coupled with a knowledge of the golden deeds and exemplars of history, delights in the contemplation of noble achievements. The student's opportunities and privileges, however, were imaginary and confined

paper; and even with these substantial drawbacks they were limited to the few hours allotted for the composition, and, therefore, momentary: yours are real and will end only with life. Again, though the British Governor-General's field of work is vast, compared with an indigenous Raja's jurisdiction in India, what is wanted in extent by you is amply made up in depth. Moreover, wisdom and foresight, courage and resolution, tact and shrewdness, love of that which is good and great and true—and these are among the marks of the higher order of statesmanship—can be exhibited in a limited sphere of action as well as in an extensive one, and in fact it is easier to carry on and supervise with success the work of administration and any important measures of reform in a compact territory than is possible in an unwieldy empire. Further, your powers are more absolute and your field of work is new, and your task, too, is more arduous and less relieved by that ready co-operation and those steady helps which the Governor-General finds in the experience, knowledge, capacities, devotion to duty and similar other requisites of successful government in the uninterrupted succession and supply of his colleagues and lieutenants and in the established law and order of routine and precedent; while you, in your own sphere, unless you are content to continue the humdrum style of work, and go where things and times will lead you and your State, like dumb-driven cattle, will have yourself sometimes to originate, elaborate, and carry out, often to supervise but always to direct, almost every measure of State, and the advice and assistance you can command, circumstanced as the indigenous administrations are, will be uncertain, halting and half-hearted, and not always reliable: and the consequence will be that, if you at all attempt anything like the work which morally devolves on you, and to specify a few particulars of which is the object why I am thrusting myself on your time and attention, your Highness will have to complain not of its smallness or lightness, but rather of its heavy and exacting nature. If, however, the task would be onerous, its successful performance, or even an honest endeavour to merit success would assuredly bring with it its inevitable reward, here and hereafter—within your bosom

a noble feeling of satisfaction, ' the purest allotted to man, ' of having done your duty, name and fame abroad, happiness to your fellowmen, credit to your family and increase of its claims on the homage and gratitude of your subjects, and the continued respect, esteem, and confidence of the Paramount Power.

The second preliminary question which might be asked is—Why do I address your Highness thus publicly? I have, as you will see from the subscription, retired from the world, and am, therefore, prevented as much by the rules of such retirement as by my own inclinations from presenting myself at the precincts of Palaces or Darbars, or obtruding privately on any public personages. Nor can I be sure, even if I were to present myself at the door of your residence, whether I should be allowed to see you or if I sent you a private communication that it would meet your eye; for, I do not know what the practice of your Darbâr in these matters is, while, on the other hand, I know there are Rajás and Nababs who hear and see only what their functionaries permit to reach them. I am, therefore, doubtful what sort of reception your officials would be inclined to give to me or my views, if sought to be privately presented. And so I have thought that to write to you and to write thus openly is the surest means of placing these letters before you. But in passing it could be as well to observe that those in attendance on great personages are inveterately given to shut out from them visitors or communications they may themselves not regard with favour, and they succeed in enforcing their wishes, because they themselves are the only media of intercourse and there is no means of penetrating the wall round their charges. The result is that men in power and position often find themselves cut off from the outside public and live in a world of their own without even suspecting it, while the public believes them to be wilful in their isolation. They must, therefore, take vigilant care that their accessibility to the general public is regulated according to their own views and wishes and satisfy themselves that their attendants do not intermeddle with it. Rulers of States and their chief ministers and advisers stand in need of such a precaution, because, to ensure an efficient

discharge of their high functions, they of all others stand most in need to know what is thought and said of their work in spheres other than their own ; but they will have no means of gaining such knowledge or a deep insight into human character, if they do not allow of their free and unrestricted approach to them. I will try to point out the full bearings of this question on the business of administration hereafter in its proper place. Here I only content myself with inviting your Highness's attention to it.

A third reason, however, for these letters being open is that, though directly addressed to you, they are designed equally for all those of your brethren—and there are many such—who are situated like yourself in regard to the advantages of education, and for all the Indian princes generally ; and further they are intended no less for the attention of those native gentlemen who have received a liberal education and imbibed a liberal spirit, and who, though subjects themselves, are holding high and responsible offices in the Native States, and are or may, as they should, be actuated by a noble desire to exercise their opportunities and talents for statesmanship in the sphere of practical politics in which they are placed, to their own credit and to the advantage alike of their masters and their subjects, and who, therefore, may naturally be expected to take into consideration whatever may be found in these letters to be sensible and practicable within the States they are helping to rule.

And this explanation of the aim and scope of these letters will also supply an answer to the last preliminary question which may occur in regard to them, *viz.*, why they are not written in any of the vernaculars but are clothed in what for all purposes, political, administrative and educational, is the *lingua franca* of the land.

Here, Maharaja, I close this first letter; and inviting you to reflect on its subject-matter, I beg to be allowed to subscribe myself—

Your Highness's earnest well-wisher
A POLITICAL RECLUSE.

Letter' No. II.

MAHARAJA,—

In my opening letter, I have indicated what special circumstances make your position among the Rajas of India exceptional, and invited you to bethink yourself of a higher task than the mere carrying out of the routine of the administration of your State as it exists ; and I may here add that the execution of that task will, as years roll on, be found more than ever to be necessary to ensure the safety and permanence in a satisfactory form of the routine itself amidst all changes of time and circumstance. Before specifying its features, however, I must draw your Highness's attention to certain conditions which are essential for its commencement and its continued success, as also for the permanent retention of its fruits, and these conditions must, therefore, be first attended to. Now, these essentials are, above all things, moral in their nature, and, therefore, they are personal, and you must show them in your own person and family and surroundings—both as a ruler and man. It would be impossible to exaggerate the heavy responsibility which, in this respect, rests on you as the ruler of your State. There was a good deal of both practical and political wisdom when Frederick the Great said that a king was but the first of his subjects, by which maxim, I presume, he meant that a ruler of men was bound to exemplify in his own beliefs, opinions and conduct, all those qualities of head and heart, all those principles and virtues, which he wished or ought to wish his subjects, in the interests of his State no less than for their own happiness, to possess and practise. The spirit of the maxim I have just quoted is not unknown in this country, where it has always been held and believed that as the king is, so the subjects are. This, then, points to the obligation which rests on the shoulders of a ruler to be the best exemplar to his own subjects.

And this grave moral responsibility attaches to you all the more, because you have received a high order of European edu-

cation; but because of that very fact I hope and trust you have not imbibed with it the prevailing spirit of scepticism or materialism, which characterizes the ordinary educated Indian of the day. There are materialistic, empirical, or agnostic schools of philosophy, and there was a time when these, represented by Mill, Mr. Bain and Mr. Spencer, had an almost exclusive sway over the minds of educated Englishmen. They exercised a similar influence over our young men; and these embraced the materialism, scepticism, or agnosticism taught by the masters of those schools of philosophy. But there are other systems taught by minds as powerful, if not more so; and a reasonable person will not come to any conclusion on the momentous questions involved in a religious belief until he has carefully studied these systems also. Already in the Universities of England, Mill, Mr. Bain, Mr. Spencer and the rest have been dethroned and the study of the systems of the German philosophers, Kant and Hegel, is now pursued with vigour; and the Indian mind has during a long course of centuries been moving on lines so entirely removed from those pursued by the empirical philosophers, that it cannot for any length of time rest content with their doctrines. The immense progress that physical science has recently made, culminating, as it has done, in the theory of evolution is no doubt considered as unfavourable to a religious belief. Nothing, however, can be further from the truth, as has been pointed out by the deepest thinkers. The foundations of religion lie too deep in the intellectual and moral constitution of man to be shaken or even touched by theories such as these. Centuries ago, the founder of the study of this science wrote:—

“I had rather believe all the fables in the Legend, and the Talmud, and the Alcoran, than that this universal frame is without a mind; and, therefore, God never wrought miracle to convince atheism, because his ordinary works convince it. It is true, that a little philosophy inclineth man’s mind to atheism, but depth in philosophy bringeth men’s minds about to religion; for, while the mind of man looketh upon second causes scattered, it may sometimes rest in them, and go no further; but when it beholdeth the chain of them confederate and linked together, it must needs fly to Providence and Deity:

may, even that school which is most accused of atheism doth most demonstrate religion: that is, the school of Leucippus, and Democritus, and Epicurus: for it is a thousand times more credible that four mutable elements, and one immutable fifth essence, duly and eternally placed, need no God, than that an army of infinite small portions, or seeds unplaced, should have produced this order and beauty without a divine marshal."

It is acknowledged that the evidence for the evolution theory is not complete; but supposing that it is, what the theory sets forth is that all the objects we see about us, including man with his intellectual and moral nature, have been developed by very slow and gradual changes out of dead matter which at one time was in the condition of vapour; and the theory of creation by God is erroneous. Now if the theory of divine creation supposes that for a long time there was nothing but God and that afterwards, by an effort of His will, all objects came into being ready made or possessed of the forms and natures which we find them to possess, the doctrine of evolution, no doubt, goes against it. But when in the early ages of humanity, men recognised the power of God in Nature, when for instance the ancient Rishis of India found Indra in the phenomena of rain and the lovely Ushas in the dawn, was such a theory of creation present before their minds? The mere occurrence of the several phenomena and the order which they observed in them all led them into the belief that they were caused by and were under the direction of wise and powerful beings. Has the doctrine of evolution destroyed these phenomena and this order? If not, man will ever seek their efficient cause and will not be satisfied by being simply told that they were gradually developed out of other phenomena. The theory of evolution itself supposes a change at every step, though infinitesimal. And the human mind is so constituted as to look for a cause whenever there is a change. So that what this doctrine comes to is not that God did not create this universe; but that He did not create it all at once. The old theory of creation supposed Him to have done this and to have, as it were, retreated from His creation afterwards, leaving it to the

mercy of certain laws which He had imposed upon it. But the doctrine of evolution represents Him to be ever present in all objects, giving them better and nobler forms; and it thus justifies the observation of the Upanishads and the Bhagavad-gita that God dwells in the heart of all things, the sun, the moon, the stars, the earth, the wind, &c., and the soul of man, and controls them and carries them through all their changes. It has thus served the cause of religion by rendering our idea of creation truer and grander.

But the scientist tells us that it is force that does all this. The several forces known to us are but different forms in different conditions of the same force. When a ball in motion impinges against another and its motion is stopped the force which caused that motion is not destroyed, but assumes the form of heat; for both the balls after the cessation of motion will be found to have risen in temperature. Heat assumes the form of light; light and heat are transformed into electricity, and electricity into magnetism. The process is also capable of inversion. The mere mechanical force, therefore, which causes motion, may under certain conditions appear as magnetism and perhaps also as vital force. Thus then, given matter and force, the whole world with its variety of vegetable and animal life is evolved out of them and there is again in all this no room for a creative mind. Still, somehow, we find order in the world and a beautiful adaptation of means to ends everywhere as if it was under the direction of a mind, a mind essentially of the same kind as ours which apprehends that order and that adaptation. Matter and force are the two great entities according to the scientist; he believes in a force, which works out certain visible results; and he speaks of the quantity of a force and of force as in store which has not yet spent itself. Matter in a certain condition, which we call effect, is traced to matter in another condition with a force existing in it; these, again, to matter in another condition still with force in another form; and so on until the scientist arrives at the ultimate molecules and still further at atoms with an ultimate force. This ultimate force cannot be traced further and must be accepted as a fact.

What is the nature of force and whence do we derive our idea of it? The eye, the ear, and the other senses cannot give it to us, as force is something hidden from all our senses. Our first knowledge of a force must, therefore, be derived from our own conscious exertion of it. I *will* to raise my arm and I do it. Here I exert a force, the force of my will, and the effect is the raising up of my arm. This is the only way in which force becomes cognizable to us and the word can have any meaning for us. When, therefore, we in modern times account for changes in external nature by the supposition of a force and arrive at an ultimate force, what else can we mean by this force but a *will*? The ancients arrived at this *will* at once and believed all those changes to have been caused by the will of Indra, Varuna, and others; but we interpose many other phenomena between those changes and the will of a living being. And this is what Bacon means when he speaks of second causes and the Deity as the ultimate cause. All causation ultimately resolves itself into will. There alone our search for a cause ends. We cannot conceive dead, inanimate nature producing any change. Our demand for a cause in the external world is based on our direct experience of it within our personality. In the infancy of our race it was satisfied by our belief in a number of deities controlling the different phenomena of nature, and in our advanced condition by our faith in the ultimate will of a Supreme God, which will is called by the scientist the ultimate force to which all the other forces are reduced and which transforms itself into a variety of other forces. From these observations it will be seen that the fault of *regressio ad infinitum* which some persons find in this argument has no basis in reality. If God is the cause of the world, God, they say, must have another cause, and that cause a third and so on *ad infinitum*. But the search for a cause means the search for a will that causes phenomena, the only cause known to us being our will. We cannot and do not seek the cause of that will. All our search for a cause ends when we find the will; so that there cannot be a further search for the cause of the will. The question, therefore, who created God, is futile.

Further, the phenomena in connection with vegetable and animal life are such that they cannot be accounted for by a play of merely mechanical or inorganic forces, or looked upon as arising from a transformation of those forces. An animal is composed of parts, which form a system and each of which discharges a function which contributes to the growth of others and through it to its own growth. In giving itself up for others, it finds itself. If it ceases to perform its functions, not only are others destroyed but itself along with them. The bodies operated on by merely inorganic forces do not form such a system, have not such a common life, do not form such a unity. Their relations are merely external. One moving ball impinges on another and communicates its motion to it; but in doing so it simply loses and does not receive anything. Even the unity introduced in such a mechanism as that of a watch by the intelligence of man is quite external; the spring communicates its motion to the wheels, but the motion does not through their action return to the spring and keep the watch going without external force such as that of the muscles of the human hand. And the highest development of this organic unity is reached in the case of man, when the organism itself becomes conscious of its own unity in the mind of man. Again, the force which keeps vegetable and animal organisms going is a force that sets at naught the inorganic chemical affinity, inasmuch as it makes the elements enter into combination in proportions in which they ordinarily do not combine. In the case of animals, immediately after they are dead, decomposition sets in, that is, the elements, free from the control of the vital force which has now disappeared, disunite, and, the ordinary chemical affinity coming into play, enter into new combinations. All this shows, therefore, that the nature and operation of the organic forces are so widely different from those of the inorganic forces and sometimes so subversive of them that the former cannot be evolved out of the latter. As the less in quantity cannot contain the greater, so the inferior force cannot in itself contain the superior force, or that out of which the superior force that overrides it is evolved. So that, if at the end of the process of gradual development the mind is evolved, it must be so because at the

very first stage of the process the mind is present. If will is at the bottom of our conception of force, we can well understand how the mind whose attribute it is manifests itself in the lower forms of gravitation, heat, and other forces, and gradually reveals itself more fully. But the reverse process of an inferior force, which is merely mechanical in its nature, developing itself into the highest organic force and ultimately into the mind, is unintelligible.

And independently of any theory of creation, the very aspect of the universe fills the mind of man with a sense of Divine presence. The earth with its mountains and caverns, its plains, its rivers and seas, its infinite variety of vegetable and animal life, its trees and flowers, and the canopy of the sky overhead with the sun shining by day and spreading its glories over all, and the stars glittering at night and the moon giving to everything a quiet, sweet, and lovely appearance, fill the mind of man with lofty thoughts and in the surrounding scene it sees beauty, grandeur, serenity, gladness, and joy, which inspire him with reverence and love. Grandeur, serenity, and joy can be the attributes only of a mind; and reverence and love can be felt only for a Being. The Great Spirit of the universe thus appeals through its aspects to the spirit of man and the spirit of man responds in tones of worship, self-surrender, and prayer. In India the Rishis in the times of the Upanishads felt this influence very strongly, and observed the Paramâtman or Great Being everywhere and in everything, and were so overpowered by that perception that in comparison with it the pleasures of ordinary life became contemptible in their eyes; and the serenity, elevation, and joy consequent upon witnessing the Divine presence became the one object worthy of being pursued by man. And elsewhere, too, this visitation of God through the aspects of the Universe is represented similarly to have contributed in a large measure to prepare the great seers of mankind like Mahomed and others for the noble task which they undertook and fulfilled.

Again, the mind of man in the perception it has of right as distinct from wrong, a perception that carries with itself an uncompromising authority and claims obedience from

us, bears in itself what has justly been called the voice of God. Various theories have been promulgated as to the nature of this distinction. Some have identified right and wrong with pleasure and pain, and others with the greatest happiness of the greatest number and its opposite; but all such theories fail to explain the sense of moral obligation, the authority which the perception of right evidently possesses to direct our will. Pity for a man in distress, or a diligent performance of the functions one has undertaken which involves the happiness or misery of thousands of human beings claims preference over a desire for personal ease, justice over selfishness, and respect for innocence over the fretful mood of an hour which sometimes leads even a mother to strike her inoffensive child. They claim preference; but, if left to ourselves, we would rather obey the inferior impulse; and, as a matter of fact, we often disregard the authority of the higher. But when we do so, we are punished, we are lowered in our own estimation and filled with a sense of shame. Now, is the preference that is claimed, the authority that is asserted, consequent upon the superior pleasure arising from that impulse? If so, it would be a case of prudence, which is not obligatory on me, which has no inherent authority over me. My pleasure or my pain is solely my own concern, and I may, if I like, prefer a smaller pleasure to a greater. But I feel myself under an obligation, which I am not at liberty to violate, to obey the higher impulse; though, of course, I have the power of violating it and often exercise it. Neither can the consideration that the higher impulse will lead to the greatest good of the greatest number claim authority over me. In itself it constitutes no obligation. Why should I prefer other people's happiness to my own? What is the source of the obligation in that respect? If it is an obligation that is felt, you only refer the authority lying in our first higher impulse to another; and, in doing so, yield to us the point we seek to make out, but with reference to another impulse. But pleasure, whether of the individual or of the greatest number, is what follows from the impulses some of which claim preference over others; it does not determine the action, it is the fruit of an action; the action follows

from the impulses alone without reference to its remote effects, and the preferential claim is asserted before the action and not after it. When through our senses we perceive a body we cannot conceive of its existence without space; and thus arises in us a knowledge of the existence of space outside as space in itself is something which we do not perceive by our senses. In the same manner, when both pity and selfishness or honour and perfidy urge our will, the right of the former to govern it in preference to the latter is felt; we feel a command to follow the one and not the other. If it is a command, it lies beyond our personality and must issue from a higher personality. And thus as our knowledge of a body leads to the knowledge of the existence of space outside, so the feeling of authority in one impulse as compared with another leads to a knowledge of the existence of a higher personality which envelopes ours on all sides and issues its commands to us. When we disobey this command, a sense of ill desert hovers about us, we feel we deserve punishment from a higher power; and in an unsophisticated condition of society such as that represented to us in the Rig-veda hymns, we find how this moral feeling naturally works itself out. The Rishis believed in a moral order as in a physical order; the Adityas, the chief of whom is Varuna, identified often with the highest God, are the guardians of that order. They hate wrong, send out their spies to all quarters, keep watch on each transgressor, and witness the good and evil deeds of men. The mighty Varuna punishes the wrong-doer, he pursues him everywhere, there is no escape from him, except in his mercy; and this is implored in the most fervent prayers addressed to him by Vasishtha in particular, who on an occasion was overpowered with his sense of guilt. This was the interpretation which the Rishis in those simple times laid upon our moral intuitions, and what interpretation can be truer?

Again, man feels himself to be a dependent being, physically as well as morally, and this leads him to the conception of One on whom he depends. He believes himself to be a finite and limited being. He can hav

finiteness or limitation, unless he had an innate conception of the Infinite and the Unlimited. Though finite and limited, he ever seeks to transgress the limits within which he finds himself enclosed, to shake off the bondage. He is forever thirsting after knowledge and after goodness, and is ever making greater and greater progress. This never-tiring thirst is impossible, unless there were hidden in his breast an ideal of the Greatest Knowledge or Omniscience and of the Highest Holiness. A belief in the real existence of such an ideal or of an Omniscient and Holy God alone can render the thirst active and fruitful. And the belief in a God with these attributes, which has come to prevail in India as elsewhere, is to be accounted for only in this way.

I have thus briefly endeavoured to show how the objections brought by evolutionists and scientists against a religious belief do not hold, and what it is in the nature of man that renders the belief as natural to him as that in the existence of an external world. I have also indicated how our ordinary human nature, intellectual, moral as well as æsthetical, worked itself out into that belief in this country in ancient times. It is impossible to do justice to the subject within the compass of a letter, long though it has become. Whole books have been written upon it. But it has been my object to show to you that this is a subject which does not deserve to be disposed of lightly, and to the consideration of which an educated man should bring all the seriousness, gravity and depth, of which he is capable. Scientists, relying only on the practical operation of the intellect without inquiring into the basis of that operation, assert that that operation does not lead them to God and the truths of religion, and they depend on expediency as the sole source of morality and guide to human conduct. In addition, however, to the mistake just alluded to in the intellectual sphere, they discard from their investigations the workings of the moral and spiritual faculties of mankind and the knowledge and experience accruing therefrom. But we are bound to accept the teachings of all our faculties alike, that is, of scientists as well as religious thinkers, saints and devotees, so far as they conform to reason and the moral sense. The foregoing observa-

tions are, it will be seen, based on this wide principle; and to supplement them I will add in the words of an English Theistic writer—

“These modern Men of (merely physical) Science are so absorbed in their material researches that they have actually dropped out of sight all the moral and spiritual sciences together; and they go about in the footsteps of Mr. Darwin, endeavouring to gather the grapes of Morality off the thorns of Physics and Zoology. No such fruit grows on such trees. Spiritual truths are spiritually discerned, and moral truths are morally discerned, and neither the one nor the other are to be got at through researches into things which are not spiritual and not moral. Is it any marvel that so it should be? If God be Himself the holy all-pervading SPIRIT of the universe, the impersonated Law of Righteousness ruling in all worlds forever, must it not be in the *spirits* of His rational children that He chiefly reveals Himself and His holy will? To imagine that He, our God and Father, never speaks in the “still small voice” of conscience, but *does* speak in the earthquake and the thunderstorm—this is the Baal-worship of modern days.”

We have then in our own constitution a guide and warranty for our behaviour in this world—for ennobling ourselves with knowledge acquired by the exercise of our intellects as well as by the attainment to moral excellence and spirituality. In other words, man's duties on earth flow from his nature taken as a whole; and the question of these duties is not affected by the mode of his creation; for, however made, man is man; “the Highest Being,” to quote the words of Carlyle, reveals itself in him; and his aspirations are higher and heavenward, not lower and bestial—and that is enough to vindicate and establish the fact of man's duties as inculcated by religion on earth. Science, of course, is not to be despised or deprecated. On the contrary it is not less essential than religion for the development and progress of humanity, the two being, in the language of Spencer, “necessary correlatives” of each other. The continued attempts of science to draw away the veil of nature are praiseworthy, and it has

thereby not only invented many means for increasing the material comforts of man, but has moreover led to a knowledge of her secrets that has destroyed many errors and superstitions. For all this service to truth and humanity in its own line, it is entitled to respect and attention; but it cannot on that account be held to destroy the basis or usurp the place of religion any more than religion can be justified in denying to science its own proper sphere. The one has no more right to rule a designing mind or moral government out of the universe than the other to declare that the sun moves round the earth, not the earth round the sun. The universe without a creator embarrasses one great philosopher; and the sense of responsibility within and the starry hosts above arrest another; and neither was bound by any restraint on his judgment. Between sacerdotalism on the one hand and agnosticism on the other, therefore, religion may well remain "free, reverent, intelligent, unhampered by incredible ecclesiastical traditions, and unclouded by scepticism." Nor can men and women do without that morality, which is so intimately allied to religion, and derives its highest sanction from it; and it is well to remember as some proof of this necessity that the history of godless eras among men has led to the reflection that, if there were no God, it would be beneficent for mankind to invent one! This is so because the foundation of society is essentially bound up with man's religious belief. There can be no thirst after holiness, unless the moral command revealed in the heart is rightly interpreted as the command of Him who rules the universe and has filled it with beauty and joy. And there can be no striving after it, if there is no faith in His mercy and readiness to guide and help poor erring humanity. Religion is the source of comfort to the afflicted heart and of hope to the despondent spirit. Moral progress, again, is essential to all progress; there can be no advance in the provinces of politics, social organisation, and even commerce and industry, unless conscience has become keen and directs the actions of man in all these matters. It is true there are philosophers and thinkers who doubt or deny the existence of God; but they, accepting a brotherhood of men without the common fatherhood of God, in place of Him worship the Good of

Humanity. Their number is small, and as long as men are men it must ever remain so; while the foundation of their general morality, however estimably it may be observed by a few of its individual followers, is equally feeble, and under the denial of a creative basis for the universe and the negation of a spiritual living fountain-source of inspiration for man is well indicated by the passage—"Human society is not an organization but a machine.....Virtue and duty, justice and injustice are mere matters of convention:" and if a higher ideal is conceived by the highest spirits among them it is traceable indirectly to the lofty standard of duty and virtue set up by religion before men from the earliest times when philanthropic secularism in the modern sense was unknown, just as the worship of Good has followed in the wake of the worship of God. The mass of mankind, therefore, with all their weaknesses and errors, will stick to their faith in a Creator and Moral Upholder. A religious paper well says:—

"For the purpose of winning a noble character it is essential that the mind of man be under the all-controlling influence of some pure and lofty aim. Various have been the answers given to the question, 'What motive, purpose, or principle is most beneficial for individual man to live under so that he may attain the true ends of life?' Religion gives the sanest and surest answer, as it goes to the centre of life and covers all that concerns it, while all other answers but deal with the surface of existence. The love of God, active trust in Him in all the affairs of life, is the most rational, satisfactory, and powerful influence that can act on the mind. Religion has always answered thus, whether it was spoken by the lips of ancient heathen philosophical devotees, Hebrew prophets, or Christian saints and sages."

The same remark holds good of the teachings of the philosophical devotees, saints, sages and prophets of all religions, Hindu, Moslem, Zoroastrian, and others; and it is the recognition of the essential truths contained in them all that is the characteristic of the liberal religion of the present age of the world, the basis of which was laid in this country by the first representative and interpreter of its modern dispensation, the great Raja Rammohan Roy, and which has nothing to fear

from any advance of human knowledge in any department, for truth is all one and no one branch of it can contradict another in reality.

I shall finally observe that if there be any sense in the notion or phrase, 'the divine right of kings to rule,' it is that kings and rulers are the vicegerents of God on earth, because of all other men they are invested with authority over the lives and fortunes of His creatures, their own fellow-men, and this authority surely must be used not only wisely but also righteously. This relationship to the King of kings was recognised by the wise Alfred, who laid the first foundation of England's greatness, when he prefixed the divine commandments to the laws he himself promulgated; and the Ranas of Udaipur (Mewar)—the proudest ruling dynasty extant in India, which dates its beginning from the times of the Saxon Heptarchy and traces its descent to the solar race of the Rajas Ram and Dasharath of Ayodhya, and the annals of which present as bright a record of courage and virtue as anywhere can be found, combined with as much of order and good government as the indigenuous system of rule could permit—have styled themselves as but the ministers of Ekalinga, the deity they worshipped. I would ask you to note these and similar instances you would find in history, and to imitate a late brother ruler of a mighty nation in Europe, of whom it has been said: "He possessed what makes every man a king in his own circle, what made him a king among kings—the strongest sense of duty, and the most noble uprightness, and with that a trust in God—that is, a faith in the triumph of good and right, which even defeats like *Jena* and *Olmitz*, and even ingratitude like that of 1840, could not shake."

Thus trustful before God and exalted among men, you must go to your work, and your first aim, i. e., first in importance and not simply in time (for it is an object which never can safely be lost sight of) is to ensure a strong sense of duty and spirit of piety among those who form the pillars of your State, the members of your aristocracy, and the heads of your bureaucracy, and to discountenance all want of principle. You must

bear in mind the truth conveyed in the wise saws—‘kings are the religionisers of the people,’ and ‘as is the king, so are the subjects.’ I quote these maxims not to suggest that you are to coerce men’s consciences, or encourage a simulation of views not really held or the suppression of opinions sincerely believed in, but to show the supreme value of a salutary example and of the necessity of maintaining a high standard of public morality and ensuring sound moral progress among the people. You will not be causing hardship to anybody by exacting a high standard of duty from those about you when even sceptics and agnostics bow to the view—

“And because right is right, to follow right
Were wisdom in the sum of consequence.”

The same sense is conveyed by another familiar saying of the day that “morality is the nature of things,” by which what is meant is that just as the world is ruled by certain physical laws, so it is also ruled by moral laws. Even free-thinkers and atheists admit this; and the admission of this great truth seems to me to lead to the other great truth—which, however, they do not admit—that those laws have an ‘intelligent source. But freethinkers will always be few and the believers many in all countries, especially in India. Your subjects, therefore, have a claim to something more than mere secular good government at your hands.

You are in a sense the head of the Church as well as of the State. You know that large sums of public money are spent in the name of charity, of religion, and of religious observances. And it behoves an enlightened Prince so to dispose of them as to bring permanent good out of this expenditure of money raised from the toiling subject. As India never formed one community politically, as it was always cut up into innumerable states, and even the villages and towns composing a state were held together by but a loose bond of unity, and there never was a strong secular government that could weld the people into one nation, so in like manner there never was a strong church government or church organization that could introduce unity into the religious

faith of the people. And the result is that side by side with the elevated religious ideas of the Upanishads and the Bhagavad-gītā we have a most irrational, complicated, and grotesque ritual, and even the fetishism and demonology of savages. Oftentimes beliefs and practices characteristic of the different stages of human progress are found illogically associated in the same mind ; and it may even be questioned whether the higher religious thought of the country exercises at present any practical influence over the people. To this result the principle of exclusiveness that has always been at work in Indian society has no doubt materially contributed. What the circumstances of the country now demand is that its higher religious thought should be brought once more into prominence, and what is inconsistent with it and characteristic of a rude and semi-civilized condition of society should be swept off, not through religious intolerance but by the introduction of a system of religious instruction, by means of books, lessons, lectures, and discourses. Culture and assiduous attention together with status and character are necessary for the maintenance and advancement of knowledge and proficiency in all lines of secular work. Yet in the highest subject of human concern and for purposes of spiritual ministrations they are held of no account here at present ! Is it a wonder that religion should lose its hold and efficacy on the public mind ? In this state of things who but an educated and enlightened Prince like your Highness can be expected to rescue it from its unmerited reproach ? For religion has been brought into discredit far less by the advance of scientific knowledge than by its own practical surrender of its spiritual functions, replacing them by dead and senseless ceremonials conducted mechanically and performed by priests more ignorant and less advanced than many of the laity, and thus rendered capable of imparting to them little or no moral strength and no intelligent and elevating support amidst their sufferings or trials in their struggle with the world. To educate the former then and to raise their status so as to fit them to command the homage and reverence of the latter and carry out their exalted functions—and people of all faiths among the tax-

payers have a claim in proportion to their numbers to State grants-in-aid of voluntary efforts, especially where there are no endowments in support of the cause—is an important item in the scheme of religious education just mentioned and it is one of the means by which a high tone of morality and a love of righteousness is to be maintained among the people. “Righteousness exalteth a nation”: so if a State is to be elevated among nations, its first ambition ought to be to aim at its own moral elevation. “The moral law,” says one of the greatest of the living historians of the day, summing up the lessons of history, “is written on the tablets of Eternity. Justice and Truth alone endure and live. Injustice and Falsehood may be long-lived, but doomsday comes at last to them in French Revolutions and other terrible ways.” The same truth is differently expressed by another writer in these words:—“The philosophy of history teaches us that the law of retribution and eternal truth reigns in the world in spite of temporary violation of it. Nemesis never closes her eyes. She observes the actions and watches the fate of nations and ‘every guilty action is avenged in this world,’ according to the expression of the immortal Goethe.” The law works with nations as it does with men, but it is not evident to a superficial examination. It is only by moral elevation in either case that its forfeit can be avoided. This moral elevation, however, is not practicable unless the State recognises the truth that men and their rulers are not the sports of Chance, but are ruled by certain *moral laws*, the existence of which imply a Law-giver, and which, therefore, are not to be regarded as mere mechanical rules to be adopted for utilitarian convenience but constitute, so to say, an organic scheme connecting men with the Highest Being and directly concerning their progress and welfare here and hereafter. Without religion man is but the creature of a moment; with it he is the child of eternity. Without the moral strength and guidance which religion imparts, government would be a curse, society would be on the road to ruin, the arts and amenities of life, which add to happiness or mitigate suffering, sweeten fellow-feeling and ennoble our nature in spite of its

many aberrations under misguided influences or views of religion, would cease to exist; while without the consolations and aspirations it holds forth, even the most exalted among men will find his earthly existence to be not only a vanity of vanities but also a dreadful dream. If this terrific picture is not ordinarily realised here below, it is because human nature and its institutions are too much embedded in religion to admit of it, even though its dictates are so often disregarded by frail humanity; for it is the spirit of religion which tends to keep up what is proverbially recognized as 'the salt of the earth.' Such is the supreme importance of the subject; and that is my excuse for dwelling on it at this great length. Yours &c.

A POLITICAL RECLUSE.

Letter No. III.

MAHARAJA,—

In my last, I have dwelt at some length on the basis of religious truth in general and pointed out the necessity and importance of example in moral principles in the ruler of a State to its good government and to the welfare and happiness of its people, which is identical with his own. Now, before proceeding to the consideration of the next question, I think it as well to refer to one feature of his family arrangement which always has an important bearing on his own peace of mind and domestic felicity, and which often though invisibly thwarts the course of the administration, and sometimes results even in danger to the interests of the State. I here allude to the many evils resulting from the existence of a plurality of wives and sons born of different mothers. The desire of offspring is a natural instinct in man and is the source of pleasure and joy in early age, and of strength and support in declining years. It has, however, its draw-back in jealousy,

isputes and enmities which are peculiarly developed under polygamy, and these evils show themselves virulently under circumstances which are calculated to produce alienations of feeling, and in which natural affection and love are replaced by bitterness, ill-will, and inextinguishable rivalries tending to destroy all harmony and neutralise and mar what to distant spectators might appear to be enviable and unfailing means of happiness. These disturbing causes are particularly associated with the possession of wealth and power which cannot be equally divided among the rivals, and can, therefore, be possessed only by one individual at a time; and their force, therefore, is in direct ratio to the magnitude of the heritage. Now this heritage is an apple of discord even among full brothers—*i. e.* sons by the same mother and father; but its power of producing dissension is greatly enhanced when they happen to be half-brothers,—*i. e.* sons by different mothers, especially when the latter are all living at the same time, and are, as is generally the case, ever busy with poisoning the minds of their children against their brothers and sometimes even against their parents, and imbuing them with the spirit of their own feminine jealousies and fratricidal ideas of ambition and of their relative rights and claims. The strifes and heart-burnings, the plans and intrigues, and plots and counter-plots, with which the very atmosphere of such a household must always be surcharged often make ‘lie uneasy the head that wears a crown’; and not only do they distract the powers and energies which should be given to the government, but, as already observed, they sometimes prove injurious to the interests, and even the existence, of the State itself. Nor are the causes of anxiety confined to the progeny alone. The mothers themselves, whether they have children or no and before or after they are born, occasion no little worry on their own account. “Polygamy,” truly observes the historian of Rajasthan, “is the fertile source of evil, moral as well as physical, in the East. It is a relic of barbarism and primeval necessity, affording a proof that ancient Asia is still young in knowledge. The desire of each wife that her offspring should wear the crown is natural; but they do not always wait the course of nature for the attainment of their wishes, and the

love of power too often furnishes instruments for any deed, however base." And the turmoil resulting from such a situation is intensified by the occasional presence of a smart and ambitious handmaid or two in the Zenana. The historian's contention may then be admitted at once that "the prince who can govern such a household, and maintain equal rights, when claims to pre-eminence must be perpetually asserted, possesses no little tact. The government of the kingdom is but an amusement compared with such a task, for it is within the Raval that intrigue is enthroned."

Against these domestic troubles and dangers, which defy the resources and darken the days of even a strong mind, the one sovereign remedy is strict monogamy, and I invite your Highness to set an example in this important respect too. Nor is this negative expediency its only recommendation. Monogamy is nature's own sacred law, and, therefore, its violation is invariably visited with distressing evils as its consequences. A holy and undivided partnership in mutual trust and love is possible only in monogamy which dissociates from the sacred union that marriage in the real sense of the term implies, all idea of sensuality, banishes jealousy and distraction from the family, and produces instead a healthy moral tone in the household and tends to the preservation of the mental and bodily vigour so much needed for a due discharge of the public duties. What nobler ideal, indeed, can a modern Indian Raja follow in this respect than that of Raja Ramchandra of ancient Ayodhya? The old law no doubt sanctions a second wife where the first is found incapable of bearing children, particularly sons. The old conditions, however, are so completely changed that there is hardly need to regard the sanction in any other than a permissive light. Still in the present state of things I freely admit that this is a matter for each individual to decide for himself; all I say is that, speaking generally from the public point of view, I do not think there is an absolute necessity for acting on it. In the first place, natural offspring is not quite so necessary to the personal help or happiness of the possessors of kingdoms, states, and large

estates as to men in private life. In fact, as already observed, children born to inherit power and greatness generally, where they exist, are occupied more with the schemes and chances or exercise of their own power and position than with concern for their parents during their declining days ; indeed, instances are not wanting in which they wish for or compass their removal by death. Again, Princes do not stand so much in need of the help and support of sons in their old age as men in humbler and less responsible conditions of life. Moreover, the devouring application of the doctrine of lapse has ceased to exist, and the State, like the family, can now, as it was before the days of the prevalence of that doctrine, be continued by adoption as well as by an heir male of the body ; and adoption offers a choice of a son and successor based on the possession of mental and moral qualities, which is denied to birth. I am far, indeed, from deprecating the natural desire for offspring of one's own body even in rulers. I am only saying that where Providence denies its satisfaction a plurality of wives cannot be indulged in without serious drawbacks, that strict monogamy accompanied by childlessness need not be considered a grave misfortune by rulers of States when men with enlightened minds and generous feelings, similarly situated in private life, are found to adopt and endow the public in place of the family, that the situation in question has its moral advantages and that the absence of an heir can be made good by adoption. I must add that the rejection by the more enlightened among Indian rulers of the custom of polygamy and their adherence to the principle of monogamy is calculated to exert a healthy moral and social influence among their own brethren, their aristocracy and their people, and through them on Indian society generally all over the land.

The next object to be attended to immediately is the training and education of your own children and of those who have in times past been and, if they choose, can under the present altered circumstances still remain the pillars of your State. " Nothing can possibly be said in favour of an

uneducated class of rulers," says a distinguished ornament of the British aristocracy, who is an eminent scholar himself, and has proved a capable ruler among the governors of British India ; but an uneducated class of rulers and an ignorant aristocracy have been, unfortunately, the rule rather than an exception in Indian society—not as an accident, as it appears to have been elsewhere, but as the inevitable result of the social polity which has ruled the destinies of this country for centuries past, and owing to which not only have ignorance and want of culture and absence of love or appreciation of knowledge characterised its kings and nobles as a class, but come to be looked upon even as their privilege, and the same feeling or fashion has descended to all men of wealth and position ; and this evil of a society which made knowledge the right and the occupation of an exclusive class has been aggravated by temporal tyranny and the consequent absence of any field for the exercise of genuine public spirit or incentive to any public virtue among the people at large. But now that a different dispensation has dawned on the land and knowledge has ceased to exist as the monopoly of a special cultus or caste, in their own interests it is needful that "the highest representatives of the Indian nobility should not rely on the privileges of birth alone. First among their countrymen, they should now be first among them in the pursuit of knowledge. [Parenthetically, I might here mention that it was a keen perception of the absence of men of substance among the pursuers of knowledge that moved an observant European Professor of an important Indian college, many years ago, to recommend either that these men should be invited to be educated, or the educated classes should be substantially raised ; but no change worth speaking of has occurred in the situation, and the representatives of the nobility have not yet, as a body, joined the pursuit of knowledge and learning. Nor have the classes which have been educated commenced to exemplify a disinterested love of knowledge or produced instances of a passionate devotion to its pursuit for its own sake and to the exclusion of any other aim or object of life, such as would impress the inheritors of wealth and position with the idea that liberal

education can serve a higher purpose than as a means of earning a livelihood and thus remove their indifference to it. [to return to the aristocracy.] "Their duties are manifold, and they cannot be discharged properly unless they themselves rise to the highest level." Princes and nobles and men of position and means, therefore, who have in the past relied only on their birth, and thus made the dreary history of that past, must turn a new leaf. The future cannot admit their continuing ignorant and uneducated as before. Even for self-preservation they must add education to their birth and position and you may well imitate Alfred the Great of old England, who under somewhat similar circumstances not only founded schools and colleges for the instruction of the people but passed a law enforcing on the nobles the education of their children. But that education must be—and this is the point to which I wish here to draw your Highness's special attention—not the sickly and dry acquisition of the elements of knowledge gathered within their own homes with the aid of obsequious teachers who have to wait on their pleasures and whims, and amidst pandering parasites who ever flatter and spoil their wards with adulation and make them wayward and capricious from early age: under such influences the young rulers grow up wilful and are fed on the notion that no man ever speaks the truth except when it suits his own ends: their moral nature is thereby destroyed and replaced by a general distrust of all truth and by faith in falsehood as a guiding principle of conduct. It is a serious thing, however, thus to poison the stream of life at its very source and great care ought to be taken to prevent it, especially as men generally are more prone to evil than to good, and impressions received in childhood are enduring. It is, therefore, a duty on the part of the parents so to arrange their surroundings that these impressions shall be of the best. On this point there is a beautiful passage in Sir T. Martin's *Life of the late Prince Albert the Good, Consort of Her Majesty Queen Victoria*, which might be appropriately quoted here. Of no duty was the Prince more careful than that of training his children and on this as in regard to many other subjects he constantly corresponded with his countryman

friend and preceptor, Baron Stockmar. It was a saying of this thoughtful preceptor that "a man's education begins the first day of his life." Those who know how powerfully children are influenced by their surroundings cannot fail to be struck by the shrewdness of this remark or its special importance to persons on whose training, temper, and character depend the welfare or misery of numberless human beings. "Good education," the Baron wrote in a memorandum on the education of the Royal children so early as the 6th of March 1842, 'cannot begin too soon.' 'To neglect beginnings,' says Locke, 'is the fundamental error into which most parents fall.' In the child affections and feelings develop themselves at an earlier period than the reasoning or intellectual faculties. The beginning of education must, therefore, be directed to the regulation of the child's natural instincts, to give them the right direction and above all to keep the mind pure.' 'This,' continues he, 'is only to be effected by placing about children only those who are good and pure, who will teach not only by precept but by living example, for children are close observers and prone to imitate whatever they see or hear, whether good or evil.'" Equally instructive is the following extract from a letter of the Baron's to His Royal Highness :—

"Continue, dear Prince, to insist upon honour, integrity, and order in your household. This inspires respect and gives a good example and warning to others. Believe me, a character and disposition like yours must be surrounded by none but the good, the loyal, and the well-disposed. At your present time of life you must have nothing to say to churlish, commonplace, repellent, or unconscientious people. Such characters, as indeed you say yourself, will only dwarf and drag you down. You must be fostered, developed and strengthened, for a time at least, by love and attachment, by unselfish and warm sympathy..."

This language pleasurably reminds one of the stories of ancient times in this country which relate that its Rajas used to place their sons for education not under common-place or worldly-minded instructors but under men of talents and ac-

accomplishments, austere virtue, much learning, plain living and high thinking; but no one now-a-days thinks of reviving either in form or spirit good old practices, which, though long subverted by untoward circumstances, involuntarily command approbation. Every body is a slave to existing custom and the highest wisdom and patriotism is held to consist in paying homage to this custom, even though it may be clearly injurious and unsuited to the requirements of the times. However, I have said enough to indicate with clearness the kind of influences which should surround young princes and nobles at home or outside. Their general education must be a manly and a vigorous prosecution of studies carried on in the class rooms of public schools and colleges, in competition with the intellect of the commonalty, under teachers inspired by a lofty regard for right and truth and in consequence commanding respect and homage from all who come under their influence and inspiring in them a love of high principles. The system under which they are trained, to quote for the third time the terse language of the scholar and statesman referred to above, must "not admit of dividing lines in educational institutions which are not the natural result of brain power, and all aristocracies are the better for a common struggle with those whose studies must be taken up in good earnest." Power and wealth, if rightly used, can conduce to great blessings; but if abused, they are the parents of equally great curses. Those, therefore, who are born to power and wealth must be taught to feel in the impressionable years of their life that those advantages have serious responsibilities attached to them, and the best mode of inspiring them with that feeling and that conviction is to educate them under conditions which would imperceptibly lead them to compare themselves with the sons of the middle classes as men, and to feel that their true worth must depend on their mental and moral attributes which the accident of birth, wealth, and position, cannot create but which are calculated to adorn and enhance it. In short, their education must tend to effect by a system what has happened to yourself by accident—they must be taught to feel that moral and intellectual excellence have greater claim to respect than mere rank and station and to realise that outside their homes they are

no better than ordinary men, and that it is their behaviour as such that alone can reflect lustre or shame on their birth or their fortunes. To this end their education and treatment must be so conducted as to counteract the enfeebling and demoralising or seductive effects of the position to which they are born. "The annals of Mewar," their chronicler observes, "seldom exhibit those unnatural contentions for power from which no other Hindu State was exempt; this was owing to the wholesome regulation of not investing the princes of the blood with any political authority; and establishing as a counterpoise to natural advantages an artificial degradation of their rank, which placed them beneath the sixteen chief nobles of the State, which, while it exalted these in their own estimation, lessened the national humiliation when the heirs apparent were compelled to lead their quota in the *arriere-ban* of the [Mogal] Empire." When a rule that is apparently so obnoxious to the self-love and dignity of absolute sovereigns finds acceptance in the proud and punctilious Rajput, there must surely be not a little virtue in it and therefore the principle which underlies it deserves to be noted. Of no less significance and of even wider applicability is the lesson conveyed by the following incident concerning the commencement of the school education of the present Emperor of Germany when his grand-father ruled and his father was Crown Prince. Young William, says the report, "was duly entered as a scholar at the public Grammar School of Capel. Imitating the practice usually observed in the country, his parents took him to the Head Master, and like ordinary citizens had him examined in their presence. Before leaving, the Crown Prince stipulated that his son was not to be addressed as Royal Highness, but to be known only under the name of Prince William and treated in all respects like other boys." This little anecdote is full of much serious import, and every ruler, great or small, (and indeed every nobleman and man of wealth and position) who consults his own happiness and the true welfare of his family and his State, ought to treasure it as a precious counsel in the training of his children in their best interests; and I commend it to your Highness's attention.

When the Princes, their nobles and the classes from which their ministers and other officers of the higher grades are generally drawn, are thus educated to a right appreciation of the responsibilities of their positions, and begin to be, as it were, instinctively inspired by noble ambition to turn their talents, their opportunities and their energies to achievements calculated to advance the public good, a most important factor of successful government may be said to have been secured. But, of course, you need not wait to begin your work till such education has taken a deep root in your own State; for the seeds of learning long ago planted by the British Government in the different parts of the country are rearing educated men in numbers, from amongst whom you can find by careful selection competent persons ready to hand; and the employment of qualified outsiders in preference to uncultivated men belonging to the State itself must act as an incentive to the latter to fit themselves for work and functions which are their birth-right, but which for the true interests of the State as a whole it is found necessary to entrust to the former because of the latter's want of fitness for them. I have here spoken only of the education of the higher orders; popular education will come in for consideration in its proper place hereafter. Yours &c.

A POLITICAL RECLUSE.

Letter No. IV.

AHARAJĀ,—

I have, in my last, quoted a weighty declaration from the lips of a cultured and wise statesman, that "nothing can possibly be said in favour of an uneducated class of rulers", and that "their duties are manifold, and they cannot be discharged properly unless they themselves rise to the highest level of knowledge." A ruler's education, however, should be

such as to fit him for the duties of his high office ; and therefore, his general culture must be supplemented by specific studies bearing on the problems of government. "Life-lore is better than book-lore. It is greater and more fruitful to be learned in life than in books;" and as rulers have to do with life and deal with men on a very extensive scale and with every variety and shade of character and condition much more than any subject can individually have to do, they must study life more than books or rather study books which open to view the springs of men's conduct in life. As to learning arts and acquiring accomplishments, rulers must aim at appreciating and encouraging them in others and not trying to excel in them themselves. Any undue attempt at the latter would not only present a pedantic example of misdirected ambition and culpable waste of energy, but might also lead to an equally culpable neglect of the work which constitutes their first and foremost duty. They, however, need not forego reading or intellectual engagements ; like all men of sound culture they may have their favourite subjects of study to which they may devote their leisure, and for which they will be all the better able to stand the demands of their ordinary work and the strain of onerous duties and cares of State. Nor, further, can they neglect knowledge which bears even collaterally on that work or is calculated to advance its quality or success. These lines of study will suggest themselves in the usual course : the one to which I wish here to invite your particular attention is rather of a character which will, along with your general education, serve as an incentive to your future task. I understand you have taken to reading "The Prince." Well, of course, it is a good book in its own way, if it is understood in the right spirit, but there is a general tendency to interpret it in a manner which has served to make the name of its author a synonym for low state-craft and unscrupulous cunning rather than far-seeing statesmanship and exalted wisdom. What I wish you to do is to study the lives of distinguished monarchs, wise statesmen, and philanthropic politicians or public men who have been inspired by constructive genius and a desire not so much to indulge in the exercise of their authority and parade their power and personality

before the world as to devote their gifts and opportunities to the permanent good of their own countries, and have, by helping to advance the cause of human progress and to repress human wrongs, contributed also to the lasting benefit of mankind—such, for instance, as Alfred the Great, Albert the Good, late Prince Consort, Elizabeth, and Victoria; Peter the Great, and Frederick the Great; Emperor Akbar and Ahilyabai Holkar; General Washington, Dr. Franklin, Abraham Lincoln; Cavour, Turgot, Pitt, Stein, Bismark; Wilberforce, Cobden, Bright, and others. I may also suggest, as being worth your attention, the life of Shivaji, so far as it was reflected in his construction of the civil government and influenced by the spiritual teachings of Ram las and Tukaram, as well as the career of Raja Savai Jayasingh of Ambar of scientific fame, founder of the modern city of Jeypur in Rajaputana, which of late years has in education and some other matters shown a commendably liberal spirit and promises to take among the Rajput States in the future the place of precedence occupied by Mewar in the past: also that of Jalamsingh of Kotah.

How can you find or make time for all these studies along with your public duties, private affairs, and personal concerns? Well, much would be practicable with regularity and method, by the adoption of which the great Akbar, who had to conduct the military and civil affairs of a vast empire, found leisure to preside over religious and philosophical discussions and even to attempt the elaboration of a new faith. For this purpose you may well adopt the truly royal rule of Alfred the Great who divided the night and day into three equal parts and out of them assigned eight hours to sleep, meal and exercise, eight to public business, and eight to reading, writing, and devotion. You will then have time for everything and everything will have its proper time. I cannot resist the temptation to quote here as an illustration of the great fruitfulness of this methodical use of time the following description of the varied activities displayed by the late Prince Consort (Gladstone's *Gleanings of Past Years* Vol. I. pp. 4, 5.):—

“His comprehensive gaze ranged to and fro between the base and the summit of society, and examined the interior

forces by which it is kept at once in balance and in motion. In his well-ordered life there seemed to be room for all things—for every manly exercise, for the study and practice of art, for the exacting cares of a splendid Court, for minute attention to every domestic and paternal duty, for advice and aid towards the discharge of public business in its innumerable forms, and for meeting the voluntary calls of an active philanthropy: one day in considering the best form for the dwellings of the people; another day in bringing his just and gentle influence to bear on the relations of master and domestic servant; another in suggesting and supplying the means of culture for the most numerous classes; another in some good work of almsgiving or religion. Nor was it a merely external activity which he displayed. His mind, it is evident, was too deeply earnest to be satisfied in anything, smaller or greater, with resting on the surface. With a strong grasp on practical life in all its forms, he united a habit of thought eminently philosophic; ever referring facts to their causes, and pursuing action to its consequences. Gone though he be from among us, he, like other worthies of mankind who have preceded him, is not altogether gone; for, in the words of the poet—

“Your heads must come
To the cold tomb;
Only the actions of the just
Smell sweet and blossom in their dust.”

So he has left for all men, in all classes, many a useful lesson, to be learnt from the record of his life and character.”

His Royal Highness was not a ruling sovereign himself but only the consort of one, and occupied a somewhat delicate position in the State, and consequently his political services to the country were indirect in form; yet the work he did was equal in amount and importance to the public interests to any which falls to the lot of many a ruling sovereign, and therefore his life is as much worthy of study and imitation as that of any sovereign ruler, statesman or philanthropist.

Now you might well enquire what I mean by recommending the perusal and study of the lives mainly of kings and warriors

and statesmen, who have distinguished themselves on the battle-field and taken part in political revolutions and carving out kingdoms, to an Indian Raja who finds himself stripped by the British Paramount Power of all field for the display of similar ambition, who cannot even communicate with his brethren except through its watchful agents, whose privileges of making wars and treaties have been taken away and lodged with that power within folds of solemn engagements and who has in the very commencement of this series of letters been enjoined a strict fidelity to those engagements among his first public duties. My reply is short and simple. It is true you are not now an independent ruler, like your forefathers, at liberty to open and conclude hostilities with whom you please, and that all your activity must be confined to peaceful operations within your own dominions; but, Maharaja, it must be remembered that peace has its victories as well as war, that the victories of peace are nobler and more beneficent to humanity, if less glittering or less bloody than those of the battlefield, and that it is the very dispensation which has deprived you of the opportunity of achieving the latter that renders it possible for, and even incumbent on, you and your brother princes to pursue the former. What is it, then, that you have to do? It is, to my mind, nothing short of *founding a State*. Your ancestors, — and —, as I have already observed, by their valour and wisdom founded a dynasty and carved out an estate: it is now yours to construct out of these materials a *State*.

But, it may again be asked, why should you disturb the present easy style of administration and go to the trouble of a change which on the face of it would be no easy task? I might reply, briefly, that on the one hand it is the highest fulfilment and wisest, and, therefore, the most beneficial discharge of an onerous duty which, however much it may be paltered with, cannot be got rid of; and, on the other, it is demanded by the spirit and the circumstances of the times which cannot be resisted with impunity, and, therefore, duty and interest alike demand at any rate an earnest attempt at its performance.

It is an old Indian saying that the possession of earthly rule is followed by the relegation of the soul of the possessor to the dark regions after death ; and, to say the truth, all human government generally, and absolute rule especially, whether carried on by individual or corporate authority, partly from the fallibility of man's judgment but more from his self-seeking and other moral faults of one kind or another leads so much to failure or denial of justice, to abuse of power, to oppression over human beings, and violation of their rights and of God's law, that its natural consequences to those on whose heads that load of the sins of omission and commission rests, may well be accepted as embodied in the popular maxim. And it is to avoid this fate after death that ideal kings of old are represented, towards the declining days of their lives, as making over the care and burden of the rule to their youthful heirs, and themselves retiring into private life so as to be able to devote their old age to penance and devotion. But it is better surely for a ruler as it is to a private individual in relation to his sphere of work to deprive power of its sting of abuse so far as it is practicable, and to exercise it for the good of his subjects for the whole of his life or as much of it as he chooses, than to divide that life into two periods—one of which is given up to its guilty use and the other to penitential retirement. This, however, is only by the way. We are not directly concerned here with the next world, and it is more to my purpose to observe that the inconveniences of absolute rule even in this life are not few nor small. An absolute ruler—and a dynasty is only a succession of rulers, and so what holds good of the link applies equally to the whole chain that is made up of such links—knows not the human happiness which the humblest private individual enjoys : his subjects look up on him as an enemy ; his servants as a game ; his relations as a rival—the nearer the relationship, the greater the envy and hatred—and he cannot be sure that his food, his medicine, and even his drinking water—albeit served in golden goblets—will be free from deadly poison ! And yet, strange to say, while every one about him is on the alert to get for himself

or for his clique what benefit he can out of him or his possessions, none but the ruler alone can feel anxious for or interested in the safety or the prosperity of those possessions! Such a spectacle ought then to be suggestive of a lesson, if not a warning. "Lucky Prince of Wales! Poor Czar of all the Russias!", exclaims an observant French writer, and the exclamation hardly needs to be explained to an oriental reader; and yet there is a great difference even from this point of view between absolute rule generally in Europe and in Asia, all in favor of the former. For, however despotic a European sovereign may be, he is subject to restraints of public opinion, ministerial counsel and constitutional usages, which have obtained nowhere in Asia, except to some extent in China, though the Chinese Government is popularly considered to be as unmitigated a despotism as any in the East. There is another drawback on this species of rule, which might also be alluded to here, and that is, its enervating effect on the mental and moral vigor of the ruler personally, and through him on the welfare of his charge. A late able Anglo-Indian statesman is reported to have made this significant remark when he heard some one speak about the wrong-headedness manifested by an African despot. "He is probably more or less mad. Men sitting up in solitary grandeur with despotic powers generally become so. You can observe it with our Indian Viceroys after a few years of Supreme Government. They get their heads turned: they cannot help it." If this observation be correct to however small an extent, it would supply abundant reason for the Government of India in their Foreign Office and for its Political Officers accredited to Native Princes to treat the aberrations of the latter with some sympathy while helping them out of their evil ways, as it should teach the wiser of the Princes themselves to set well-defined but safe limits to the exercise of their power. For, the Viceroy, though highly educated and fitted by talent and general experience for the post he holds, is after all a subject himself, liable to be called to account at every step: he is bound by rules and responsible to higher authority, and he holds office only for a lustrum; while the Rajas subject to his control have very little education and

training, they rule for life and inherit irresponsible power and authority. That in spite of these and similar other disadvantages, the Native Princes of India possess the mental stamina they do, speaks much for the innate capacities of the race, and affords a reasonable hope that with a few well-considered changes of method and a considerate and sympathetic treatment and help, their administration of their territories may be advanced to the requisite standard in the not distant future. But to return to the point in hand. It is not domestic enemies alone, however, that an absolute ruler has to dread. Neighbours, powerful or ambitious, are even more to be feared, because, while the former only aim at supplanting him on the *gadi*, the latter would subvert the *gadi* itself. It is true the Paramount Power in the country now has guaranteed the permanent maintenance of the existing Native States against internal and external foes; but while the conditions of protection against the latter are defined and clear, the nature of their obligations in respect of security against the former and, therefore, indirectly against itself, are vague and indefinite, and might be inferred from one of the grounds assigned for annexations in the past *viz.*, the existence of misrule. The dominions annexed were regarded as the estates of the ruling families and not as States in which the rulers and the ruled by an explicit—I say *explicit* because in all governments, however despotic or back-ward, all relations are *implied*—reciprocation of powers and privileges, rights and obligations, formed so many organic societies, the heads of which could not be injured—much less removed—without their respective bodies politic feeling the shock. The internal protection of the States, with all their powers, privileges and dignity, therefore, is far from unconditional, though the conditions may not be expressed clearly and definitely or in detail in the treaties. A late Viceroy, speaking at a dinner given by one of the leading Princes of India, is reported to have said:—

“ Indeed, I do not know in the world a more enviable position than that of the Princes of India, enjoying as they do under the ægis of the British *imperium* an absolute immunity from

those anxieties by which chiefly European States are perpetually exercised; namely, dangers threatening them without, and the fear of revolution within. They are able to give their whole time and attention to the most interesting and the noblest task which can occupy the human mind—the advancement of their States along the road of progress, and the increase in material welfare and happiness of the millions who are entrusted to their charge. Such a field as this is amply sufficient to satisfy the widest ambition or the most soaring aspiration that ever entered the heart of man; and not only so, but they have the additional satisfaction of knowing that her Majesty and her Government have but one desire; that is, to extend to them, on all occasions, the heartiest sympathy and assistance, to do everything in their power to augment their prestige, support their authority, and enhance their personal consideration. *In return we ask them for nothing but that they should administer their States wisely and beneficently in accordance with their lights and the local requirements of their situation*; for the long years of traditional and unswerving loyalty, exhibited through many generations on their part, renders even the mention of such a requirement as fidelity to their Sovereign unnecessary.”

I have underlined the clause which, for my purpose, is the most important; but I am free to confess that this eloquent passage, which was spoken, as it were, demi-officially and, in a sense, impersonally at a festive gathering, is defective inasmuch as, while indicating clearly the duties of the Indian Princes and their felicities, it ignores entirely obvious considerations on the other side of the question. For instance, it does not even remotely allude to the one source of anxiety which mars the happiness of the Princes and often makes them feel the lot of the humblest *subjects* of the British Government to be enviable compared to that of its feudatory *allies*. For, it is a very common remark, which finds utterance from every mouth wherever an illustration of the truth occurs, that while the former have the privilege of an open trial and protection of the law even when charged with the worst of crimes, the latter do not share its benefit even in cases of suspected mis-

behaviour. This feeling of course will not find expression on conventional occasions or in formal communications; but to any one who is acquainted with the under-currents of thought and feeling it is as clear as his own existence. Nor does the extract made above allude to the internal difficulties of the princes in the matter of administrative reform or even good government on existing lines. I must, however, reserve the consideration of both these points for my next; and meantime, Maharaja, I remain.—Yours &c.

A POLITICAL RECLUSE.

Letter No. V.

MAHARAJA,—

The nature of the relations existing between the British Government and the Native States has a very important bearing on the aim and object of these letters, and the present number, therefore, must be devoted to the consideration of that question.

Under the treaties and engagements, which exist between the two parties, every Indian Prince is afforded by the Paramount Power complete protection against danger from without or revolution from within. But that Power in dealing with the Princes has practically to rely on the reports and views of its own officers who act the part of their censors and critics more generally than of friends or even unprejudiced judges. The result of this arrangement is that the very existence of the Prince as a ruler depends too often on the opinion of a single individual and he, too, an alien in race, language, religion, sentiment and habits of thought. The mischief arising from this divergency is further increased by the fact that the latter is immeasurably superior to the former in education and culture, and possesses, in his own individual training, experiences and aptitudes for business, and still more in

the system of graded authority and constitution of the Government he serves and represents, immense advantages over his diplomatic or political charge in the conduct of every official transaction and especially in every dispute between them. This serious drawback in the position of the Indian Princes, as I have already remarked, is not noticed in the passage from the Viceroy's speech I have quoted in my last letter. The passage in question merely describes the principle of interference, or more correctly the condition of non-interference, in general terms and therefore reads easy and smooth, but the difficulty which it covers is felt and perceived whenever it has to be applied to specific cases: and this difficulty arises from the very nature of the situation. For, you, Maharaja, and your brethren, are not now independent sovereigns so that the Paramount Power could have no concern with, or nothing to say to, the manner of your internal administration, nor are you its official subordinates to be dictated to by it, in detail, regarding it. You are in *subordinate alliance* with it and herein lie the advantages as well as the difficulties of your situation; for, if you have not to defend yourselves against foreign or domestic foes, you have to perform the not very easy task of keeping a distant arbiter of your fate pleased through his agents, whose judgments, though dictated by pure motives and good intentions, are liable to be influenced not only by your real faults and shortcomings, but may also be unconsciously misled or warped by their varying temperaments, their personal opinions or prejudices, or by the workings of adverse parties or cliques, and even by a concern for the interests of the Paramount Power itself whether as they are in reality, or as its representatives may conceive them to be. Hence it was, I take it, that the Viceroy, in whom genial frankness and instinctive love of fair-play were united to other qualifications for that high office and who, from a sympathetic personal intercourse with your brethren, perceived the injurious effects of these causes on the relations between them and his own Government, styled the Political Agents, "dangerous officials." But it is plain that it is the system or rather the anomalous position in which they are placed at the courts of Native Princes that makes "danger-

ous officials" of gentlemen who, outside that system or position, make more safe and efficient administrators and officers. This evil, however, is not new and the root of it is thus noticed in Chapter viii of vol. 1 of Col. Tod's "Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan":—

"With our present system of alliances, so pregnant with evil from their origin, this fatal consequence (far from desired by the legislative authorities at home) must inevitably ensue. If the wit of man had been taxed to devise a series of treaties with a view to an ultimate rupture, these would be entitled to applause as specimens of diplomacy.

"There is a perpetual variation between the spirit and the letter of every treaty; and while the internal independence of each State is the groundwork, it is frittered away and nullified by successive stipulations, and these positive and negative qualities continue mutually repelling each other, until it is apparent that independence cannot exist under such conditions. Where discipline is lax, as with these feudal associations, and where each subordinate vassal is master of his own retainers, the article of military contingents alone would prove a source of contention. By leading to interference with each individual chieftain, it would render such aid worse than useless. But this is a minor consideration to the tributary pecuniary stipulation, which, unsettled and undetermined, leaves a door open to the system of espionage into their revenue accounts—a system not only disgusting but contrary to treaty, which leaves 'internal administration' sacred. These openings to dispute and the general laxity of their governments coming in contact with our regular system present dangerous handles for ambition: and who so blind as not to know that ambition to be distinguished must influence every vicegerent in the East? While deeds in arms and acquisition of territory outweigh the meek éclat of civil virtue, the periodical visitations to these kingdoms will ever be like the comet's,

‘Foreboding change to princes.’

"Our position in the East has been, and continues to be, one in which conquest forces herself upon us. We have yet the

power, however late, to halt, and not anticipate her further orders to march. A contest for a mud-bank has carried our arms to the *Aurea Chersonesus*, the limit of Ptolemy's geography. With the Indus on the left, the Brahmapootra to the right, the Himalayan barrier towering like a giant to guard the Tatarian ascent, the ocean and our ships at our back, such is our colossal attitude! But if misdirected ambition halts not at the Brahmapootra, but plunges in to gather laurels from the teak forest of Arracan, what surety have we for these Hindu States placed by treaty within the grasp of our control?

“But the hope is cherished, that the same generosity which formed those ties that snatched the Rajputs from degradation and impending destruction will maintain the pledge given in the fever of success, ‘that their independence should be sacred;’ that it will palliate faults we may not overlook, and perpetuate this oasis of ancient rule, in the desert of destructive revolution, of races whose virtues are their own, and whose vices are the grafts of tyranny, conquest, and religious intolerance.”

Much of the grave catastrophe dreaded and also the fond hope cherished by the historian have been simultaneously realized; for the reflections quoted above were published in 1829, since which date gigantic changes have taken place and the torrent of British Power on the Indian continent has overflowed all its natural boundaries, and is still showing a tendency to run further east, north and west: it has swallowed the whole of Burma and is threatening Afghanistan and trying to scale even the giant barrier of the Himalayas; and yet, strange to say—this is undoubtedly, like the rest of the occurrences, a providential event—many of the Native States within those borders, and especially those respecting the independence of which the gallant writer so pathetically pleaded, have remained intact and safe. This political miracle was due to the moral crisis created by the Mutinies of 1857-58 which put an end to the existence of the East India Company. That Corporation had risen to political dominion from the smallest beginnings and, though it had at last attained the position of a superior to all the Native potentates, its relations with them

were not free from the jealousies and suspicions of a rival in power; but this situation changed when the Company was superseded by, and the Native Rulers came face to face with, the British Crown, and, being reduced formally to the status of feudatories, were guaranteed permanent safety with the concession of the right of adoption.

This change in the position of the Native States, however, has not deprived their relations with the Paramount Power of the objectionable features ascribed to them by Colonel Tod; it has only changed their mode of operation, and thus it is that the Residents or Political Agents have become, or rather continue to be, even in the altered circumstances of the case, "dangerous officials" to the Native States, instead of being, as they are supposed and fitted to be, their best friends and safest guides. For, these States have now no fear of being conquered or annexed, but they are more liable to the danger of a disintegration and supersession of their authority by that of the British Government within their own limits. Even sixty years ago Colonel Tod saw reason to remark—"That our alliances have this tendency cannot be disputed. By their very nature, they transfer the respect of every class of subjects from their immediate sovereign to the paramount authority and its subordinate agents." The truth is that the institution of Residents and Political Agents is suitable and can work fairly and satisfactorily only when it is natural, or, in other words, subsisting between Governments and States with reciprocal obligations and privileges; for these representatives in that case serve not only to watch the interests of their own Governments, but also to explain and remove misunderstandings, to ensure equal and fair dealing and thereby to preserve peace and amity between them and the powers they are accredited to; but here the arrangement is practically all one-sided. It is true the British Political Agents are placed in Native States not only to guard the interests of the Paramount Power, but also to aid and advise the Native Princes, and not to annoy or injure them. It is undeniable, however, that their main function after the care of the interests of their own Government is the check and criticism of the conduct of their charge:

and this circumstance joined to the many causes of the divergency between them and the Princes already mentioned often tends to make them unsympathetic critics and "dangerous officials", to whose vanity or love of power are ascribed measures of interference which their Government may adopt towards the princes but which being looked upon as acts of highhandedness procure for the authors or supporters of misrule the public sympathy that is due to its victims. This state of things is, in the end, baneful in its effects on the trustful and cordial relations which ought to exist between the Paramount Power and the Feudatory States, but it must continue as long as constitutional remedies are not adopted.

Now, what should these remedies be? I cannot undertake to answer this question with any confidence, but there is little doubt that the result to be aimed at is that on the one side individual political officers must be deprived of the powers they now possess virtually of deciding the fates of ruling houses and their thousands of subjects, and on the other the forces which are inherently arrayed against the cause of good government in the States themselves must be overcome. How is this double reform to be secured? It has been remarked by some one that the political officers are intended to be the mentors of the Native Princes, but that the system is also calculated sometimes to make them their tormentors, and such a situation cannot but tend to weaken and demoralise the latter out of that energy and honourable ambition which the extract from the Viceregal speech quoted in my last letter appeals to and invites them to put forth. Self-respect is "the corner-stone of every virtue with States as with individuals," and it cannot flourish in a ruler whose public repute or position as a ruler and even peace of mind are dependent entirely on the opinion, if not the breath, of an individual Political Officer who is practically both his accuser and judge. A radical change must, therefore, be made in the position of the Political Agent, and the best mode of effecting the change seems to me, after giving the question all the thought I can, to be that he, the Political Officer, should be held responsible *along with the Raja* for the good government

of the State to whose court he is attached; and should he, in his discharge of that or any other duty, be dissatisfied with the conduct of the latter and bring forward any accusation against him, the function of deciding on the merits of the charges or questions which may be raised must be left not to the Foreign Department of the Government of India to which the Political Officer is a subordinate and under the direct instructions of which he acts at every step in each case, but to a special tribunal composed of the peers of the accused and the representatives of any of the other interests which may be concerned, and presided over by a British jurist—a tribunal the finding of which could be trusted to be free from bias or influences calculated in any way to be prejudicial to justice. A satisfactory solution of this problem might well be urged on the attention of the Viceroy personally by the Indian Rajas on suitable opportunities, for of course it is a very delicate question and it would be impossible for them to deal with it in any formal manner; but this very circumstance renders the existing position of things all the more unsatisfactory. Indeed, almost any other arrangement, even leaving the States to their own devices, would be preferable to the present under which the Viceroy with the Foreign Department and its subordinates virtually are accusers, jury and judge; and His Excellency, while in that capacity practically deposing a Raja, has, as head of the entire Government, almost with the same pen to address the condemned ruler as “My Honoured and Valued Friend”! This is, of course, a diplomatic necessity of the situation, but it sounds to common sense as morally grotesque; and what is morally grotesque can hardly be politically wise or even expedient in the long run. A proper adjustment of the relations between the Government of India or rather its Political Agents and the rulers of the Native States is, therefore, urgently needed, and so long as this question is not fairly settled, I venture to think it unsafe to assume that these rulers have the satisfaction of knowing, in the words of the Viceregal utterance quoted in my last, that “Her Majesty and Her Government have but one desire; that is, to extend to them, on all occasions, the heartiest sympathy and assis-

tance, to do everything in their power to augment their prestige, support their authority and enhance their personal consideration." This conviction, however, is to be ascribed not to any disbelief in the sincerity of the kindly intentions or declarations of that Government, but must naturally result from the unsatisfactory character of the arrangements by which its relations with them are maintained. A modification of those arrangements, therefore, as already explained, is clearly called for, and this change, as has been hinted at above, must be calculated to overcome the difficulties which naturally beset the position of Native Princes in regard to good Government in their territories.

The Native Princes being absolute rulers, they appear at first sight to be the sole source of all obstacles to any change ; but a nearer acquaintance will show that view to be not quite correct. As a body they are undoubtedly intelligent, but they are not all equally devoid of a love for their subjects or the desire to govern them well ; yet the general complaint is that their rule is oppressive. How is this to be accounted for ? The fact is the Princes are after all individuals and are not only subject to the unwholesome influences of their early training but in the absence of any system are helplessly in the hands of their surroundings. Now, these surroundings consist of vested interests of all sorts in whose eyes the one merit on which the existence of the State rests is indiscriminate charity to idlers of sorts and indulgence to the privileged and official classes, and the one sin is strictness in the expenditure of the taxes or justice to the toiling Ryot. In such a situation zeal for reform or love of economy cannot be expected to flourish ; nor can any reforms, if introduced by a strong-willed ruler, be trusted to be safely carried out for any time or continued by a successor. Is it then a wonder that they should let well alone ? Here is an illustration which relates to a time not a decade old. A very shrewd, intelligent and energetic Prince was interviewed by a disinterested visitor, who urged on him the advisability of his spending money on the comforts and conveniences of his people. In reply he was addressed thus, when the two were alone :—

“Brother, what use setting apart lakhs of rupees in a lump for Public Works? Do you think we need prompting in such a case? I should like very much to have reservoirs for my people, and roads and gardens. If I could, I would gladly build a railway, too. You ask why I don’t, and you are disappointed. My heart may not be as warm as yours—when you are poor, you can afford to be extremely liberal. But, brother, will you enjoy parting with your lakhs even for charity, when you cannot be sure that an account will be rendered to you? When I give a lakh, and find a work done for forty thousand, and when I am snubbed in private or even officially insulted if I ask to be shown the details of construction, what, do you think will be my feelings? I know I am not to carry my wealth with me; let me reserve it for my heirs who may be better able than myself to have sixteen annas worth for a rupee.”

Now this standard of return for money is perhaps too patriarchal to be secured in any public expenditure even when hedged in by a system of checks and counter-checks; but situated as the Native Administrations are, without the help of any reliable agency or system or even the sympathy and support of a strong public opinion, is it impossible to sympathise with them in their difficulties?

I may cite another instance of a Raja equally intelligent, who, when asked to raise the salaries of his officials to prevent them from levying exactions from his people, answered: “What would be the use? They will get the increased salaries and continue the exactions all the same.” Here was a confession of helplessness even in an absolute ruler, to which I have already referred. This same Prince had employed an educated gentleman and put him in charge of the judicial work. In a case coming up from the districts his officer issued an order which was sent for execution in due course. In a few days, however, one of the parties came back loudly complaining that the order had not been executed and the delay was hurtful to his interests. The explanation was this. There was an able and experienced courtier of the old school, a native of the place, who had filled the highest posts in the State, but

who, though not in the service any longer (in fact he had been debarred from office for some misbehaviour at the instance of the British Government), because of his knowledge of State affairs and his large following possessed influence with the Darbar and in consequence was resorted to by all disappointed suitors to gain their ends. The party dissatisfied with the decision in the case referred to obtained through his influence secret instructions to the district official to suspend execution of the judicial order. When this interference with the course of justice was resented by the highest judicial officer, the old gentleman remarked in all sincerity that, if all things were to be managed straight in Native as in British territory, what should constitute a Rajvada or a Native Court? It is some twenty years since the two incidents just related occurred; and during this interval people in power even in the Native States have learnt the advantages secured by liberal professions and love of progressive *forms* of administration, and so an honest avowal like that of the old courtier will not be easy to obtain in these days; yet I doubt if the old obstacles to reform are less powerful now.

How, then, is reform to be introduced and maintained in the face of those obstacles? It has been already shown that, though a ruler is inclined to introduce measures of reform, the inertia of his surroundings and the vested interests arrayed against the change would thwart their successful execution even during his own life-time and the chances after him would be still more uncertain unless there was continuous extraneous help against which such obstacles would be powerless; and this help would be effectually forthcoming if the Political Agent were to share with the Raja his responsibility for efficient administration. In that case, the Political Officer will be able to realise the difficulties in the way of the Prince better than he now can, and then, but not till then, will his authority and influence be truly utilized in the promotion of good Government in the State. The anomaly of the present system is that the Rajas are backward and even if they are personally educated their surroundings rivet them to that condition. To enable them to rise above it, which

the British Government not unreasonably expects of them, it is bound to give them the needful aid especially when it can do it without inconvenience or sacrifice; and this I submit it can do by holding its Political Officers formally responsible along with the Native Rulers for the character of their administrations. Then truly can the Native rulers be made sincere friends and friendly allies "leaning on the dominant power by seeking its counsel and following its example;" and thus the same measure which improves the character of the relations of the British Government with the Native Princes will also tend powerfully to advance their administrations in the wished-for direction.

It is time, I submit, this question received earnest consideration. But how is it to be secured? The position of the Princes themselves as already observed is too delicate to permit of their moving in the matter. The subject would seem properly to fall within the province of the Government of India which has to initiate as well as carry out measures of policy for the Indian empire. But none the less does it require to be urged on the attention of that authority as well as on that of the Government in England by the general public which is interested in a just, safe and sound imperial policy and in the permanency of the relations between India and England. I take it for granted that the existence of well-managed and friendly Native States presided over by trusted and trusting rulers would be a far greater advantage to British India, than their total absence. To the Government it would be a source of moral strength as it is an element in its political greatness; to the people, of social and economical benefits; but their present relations with the British Government are not calculated to produce the greatest good the situation is capable of yielding. The British Government further is morally bound to cherish the Native States at their highest, because, in the first place, after a century of scrupulous observance of engagements, an English historian could truthfully declare that "English valour and English intelligence have done less to extend and to preserve our Oriental Empire than English

veracity"; and secondly, the English nation through their Sovereign has solemnly proclaimed to India, that "while We will permit no aggression upon Our Dominions or Our Rights to be attempted with impunity, We shall sanction no encroachment on those of others. We will respect the Rights, Dignity and Honor of Native Princes as Our own". This declaration was made in 1858 when it was acknowledged that the Native States had acted as breakers to the storm which had immediately preceded that year. In the third place, the burden of governing British India itself is proving heavy and a desire to share it with the Indian Princes has begun to find expression from the lips of its Governors, and offers of co-operation in one important department, the military, have already been sought or welcomed. But this co-operation cannot be so hearty or successful as it should be nor can it re-act so beneficially on the conduct of affairs in Native States as it ought unless the same spirit is extended to the political relations between the two parties, and naturally the military or administrative rapprochement must proceed from the political as its basis. Then, again, this Indian dominion, the major portion of which willingly allowed itself to pass into English hands, and was not strictly speaking "conquered by the sword," has been ruled not on the principles of force and repression but on those of an enlightened and liberal policy. Still, partly from the nature of the situation and partly from other causes which cannot be entered into here, it will, I imagine, be long before the political aspirations of the people can find full scope under British rule, or any large share of real power and initiative will be placed in their possession. On the other hand, I believe all sober statesmen hold that a fifth of the human race cannot always be governed under leading strings without the risk of a natural revulsion in some shape or other and sooner or later, and that it is both wise and just to leave it a fair and unrestricted field for autonomy in all lines of public life and national existence; and the need and the utility of such field for the exercise of indigenous talent is evident from the fact that this talent which would remain without scope in British territory finds employment in the highest posts in Native States

without reference to race, creed or locality. It is thus that irrespective of the place or province from which they may happen to hail, Moslem Ministers serve Hindu Rajas, and Hindu Diwans act under Mahomedan Nababs, while Parsi Karbharis are patronised by both classes of potentates. From this point of view it would behove the British Government to create and maintain Native States if there were none: it, therefore, goes without saying that those which already exist should be cherished at their best. Their existence might further be useful to the growth of a healthy type of civilization under foreign influences which are directly at work in British India, and indirectly in Native Territory. For all these and other reasons,* then, I believe we shall have Native States in India, but they must also be well managed and progressive; and to secure this end the British Government must give them its guidance and help, and still more protection against itself or, more correctly speaking, against its agents, either in some such manner as is indicated above or any other which may be deemed meet. This will settle one half, and by no means the less important half, of the problem before us. The other half, Maharaja, will rest with you and your brethren. But it is time to close this letter. Your &c.

A POLITICAL RECLUSE.

Letter No. VI.

MAHARAJA,

In my last I have discussed, with tolerable fullness I hope, the question of the relations between the British Government

*Since the observations in the text were first published, the East India Association adopted the following Resolution at a meeting held on the 5th December 1889 which is quite in conformity with them:—

“That this meeting considers that the maintenance of the rights, status and privileges of the Native Princes of India is essential to the prestige of the British Government, and to the public interests and welfare of the inhabitants of India generally.....”

and the Native States in India as they are, and observed that a reform in those relations is urgently called for in the interests alike of justice, good government, and good policy. The nominal position of the States at present is that of internal independence; but the British Political Agents are and from their position must always be, busy in accumulating black marks against their rulers, and when its Foreign Office considers the score sufficiently heavy, or when a disturbance occurs in a State, the Paramount Government considers a wholesale interference including a supersession or deposition of the individual ruler justifiable. It is true that these Agents also report the good conduct of the Princes and the Supreme Government reward it with honours and titles, but this circumstance for reasons already explained can hardly touch the fringe of the administrative problem, which, therefore, remains to be solved; and the only method which at present is available is the one of violent interference from without. But that method acts in a spasmodic manner and, if anything, tends rather to create among the people at large sympathy for the author of the misrule sought to be remedied. Now, if it right thus violently to cure the evil, it ought to be equally right, and it is certainly better, to prevent it or rather to induce, help on and sustain in its place a gradual growth of reform from within. Probably no better means of bringing about such a result or disposition of things could be devised than to hold the Political Agents responsible for the proper administration of the Native States equally with their actual rulers, and if they in their efforts to fulfil that function have any complaints to urge against the latter, these complaints ought to be heard and decided by an independent tribunal, and not by the head of the executive department of which the accuser is a direct subordinate and which happens, generally speaking, to be already identified with his action because that action is shaped by its own orders. The Foreign Department of the Government of India is virtually bound to look to all matters and questions its Agent submits more or less through the colour of his spectacles, as it cannot stultify itself or discredit him, without undermining his authority and endangering the working of the entire system. This arrangement, as I have already

remarked, is fair neither to the Political Officers nor to the Princes to whose courts they are attached and who, while thus dependent for their very existence on the judgment or even the caprices or errors of individual officers, cannot be inspired by that feeling of self-respect and moral strength which are so essential to the conduct of all efficient rule. Accordingly, the present relations between the Political Officers and the Princes ought to be so modified as to place all the influence wielded by the former, which means in reality the influence and authority of the Supreme Government, at the disposal of the latter for purposes of good Government without detracting from the personal prestige or dignity and the position of the Princes. This, to my mind, is the direction which the reform of the relations between the British Government and the Native States must take, and as an additional justification for this view it is well to remember that in every case in which the Native system of administration has been reformed the chief motive force has been the influence and authority of the Political Agent and of the Government of India either directly exercised on occasions of minority or supersession of the ruler or indirectly supporting the administrator who has brought about the change. What I propose then really amounts to nothing more than the systematic application of this method shorn of its violence and possible injustice to individual rulers, and retaining all its beneficent consequences. For, circumstanced as the Native Princes at present are, they are not only generally powerless to adopt or carry out reforms, but their true position is often incapable of being properly represented and thus in one sense it may be said that their version of a dispute is rarely heard. All these difficulties and anomalies would disappear under the change of system herein proposed; and when it is effected, it will have disposed of one-half the problem now facing both the Native Princes and the British Government, and it is only then that the former can really feel that the latter have (to use once more the terse language of the Viceroy already quoted) "but one desire ; that is to extend to them on all occasions the heartiest sympathy and assistance, to do every thing in their power to augment their prestige, support their authority and enhance their personal

consideration" The settlement of the other half of that problem which will then be rendered comparatively easy rests, as already observed, with the Princes themselves, *viz.*, to reform the administration of their territories so as to be able to rule them "wisely and beneficently in accordance with their lights and the local requirements of their situation," and thus render themselves invulnerable on the only side on which they are open to attack; for their loyalty to the Crown of England even under the trying circumstances of their position has become traditional like its recognition by the Suzérain. Loyalty alone, however, will not save them: they must advance administratively and maintain their position, or gradually cease to exist. Of overt and sudden annexation in defiance of the obligations of treaties and of her Majesty the Queen's solemn promises of 1858, which I have referred to in my last, there need be no fear. The English nation will not consciously commit or sanction such a gross violation of right, but the Princes must know that they cannot count on its forbearance without taking note of two forces—official and non-official, which go to shape public opinion—the former of which is formed by the daily note-taking and communications of the Political Officers, and the latter by a variety of private, irresponsible and non-descript agencies working through the public press. No cause and no body, however innocent, that does not stand well with these two factors of the public opinion which rules the English Government and nation, need expect either justice or mercy from either. This remark will, perhaps, put you in mind of how some really good people have suffered by neglecting, and bad men flourished and made a name by wisely taking in hand, some of the elements which go to constitute these forces; but I do not think that that undignified course lasts or remains undetected long or entails in the end less cost and humiliation, and neither the Princes nor their Ministers have any right to sacrifice the dignity or the resources of the State simply to secure immunity from personal trouble or escape from an irksome position at the expense of the commonwealth which they are bound to conserve. Such conduct is as much a commission of wrong as despoiling a neighbour. Therefore, I

hold that without doubt the straightest, surest, wisest and worthiest course—one which combines duty with interest, and honour with policy—is for you and your brethren to turn their Principalities into *States*, as I have already suggested, and thereby formally to create that identity of interests, or rather remove that apparent absence of such identity between yourselves and your subjects, which is the main, indeed the only excuse for the Paramount Power for interfering with the affairs of the Native States. The policy of annexation, solemnly abandoned thirty three years ago, is now condemned on all hands ; but that condemnation is calculated all the more to give force to the policy of interference which has succeeded to it, and against which all that has to be said concerns only the mode of carrying it out. Peace and order are essential to the security of Government and subject alike, and the more civilised the Government, the greater is the care it takes of them ; and the British Government, which fosters so much the arts of peace, naturally cares, above all, for the maintenance of that peace and order throughout the territories subject to its rule and influence. The protection it affords to the native rulers of India against their own subjects is rightly considered to deprive the latter of their old and usual method—rebellion—of seeking redress against oppression or wrong. Hence arises the moral obligation of the British Government to put down such oppression, and hence the excuse for its interference. If you and your brethren wish to obviate it, do adopt such constitutions as will place in the hands of your subjects peaceful and efficient remedies for all administrative wrongs they may be liable to or may think they are suffering, and when this is done to the extent that is possible under the circumstances, the British Government will cease to concern itself with your internal affairs, because it will have no ground or excuse for it ; and will see that then it will be acting in opposition not to the Rajas *as against their own subjects*, but against the entire States, their Rajas *and subjects* together, and for such interference not only will it have no motive, but it will be contrary to its professions, its self-interest, its policy ; and these causes together with its

sense of righteousness and justice will always dissuade it from that course: in fact in such a situation the interests or rather the attitude of the two parties will be identical. Then indeed the Indian Princes can fight with the British Government for their rights and interests on equal ground, the essential condition of which in the authoritative words already quoted is "that they administer their States wisely and beneficently in accordance with their lights and the local requirements of their situations."

Now, it seems to me that to carry out this object and ensure its permanence it is necessary to adopt principally the following measures :—

I. The separation of the *Khang*i or Private from the State treasury.

II. A written code of laws.

III. The separation of the judicial from the executive offices.

IV. The creation of an audit department as a check on all expenditure of the administration.

V. A systematic employment of qualified official agency, its retention during good behaviour and efficiency, and provision for superannuation or invalid pension.

VI. Delegation of powers and distribution of responsibility.

VII. An elastic system of district administration.

VIII. The constitution of (a) a general or Cabinet Council to regulate and (b) a Privy Council to supervise, the whole administration under the presidency of the ruling authority.

IX. Subsidiary measures like education, promotion of arts, institution of orders of merit, &c.

X. A consultative popular assembly, and publication of annual accounts and report of the administration.

Of these measures, the first three were originally laid down more than twenty years ago by the late lamented Major Evans Bell, whose knowledge of the position and requirements of Native States was equalled only by his heartfelt sympathy with and earnest desire for their permanence. The rest might suggest themselves to any ordinary observer of the administra-

tive system of British India as being subsidiary helps to carry out in practice the three main constitutional principles laid down by the intelligent student of their history and the sincere friend and advocate of their welfare for the purpose of removing the radical defects of indigenous rule in India, and thus making it the means of happiness and progress among the people subject to it. They, therefore, deserve the most serious and earnest attention of the heads of the Native States themselves and of all those who desire to see them happy and prosperous in themselves and enabled to contribute their appropriate share to the general progress alongside and under the influence of the British Government in India. The general bearing of these measures on the object aimed at here is so plain that I will only make a few notes on each of the heads mentioned above, beginning with—

The separation of the Khangi or Private from the State treasury. A Khangi treasury exists in most, if not all, States, but in many it exists only in name, and in none is it really separated or divided from the public or State treasury in the sense used by Major Bell and intended to be conveyed here. To effect such separation, the demands of the ruler's family for all their ordinary private expenses, and of the ruler himself for his own personal and public charges on the yearly revenue, must be fixed. The rest of the fiscus must be regarded as the assets of the general administration. The amount of the former charges may assume the form of a *proportion* of the entire revenue or a lump sum fixed on a liberal estimate of the various items it has to cover. The former mode would be preferable to the latter and would, as it should, make the Raja a sharer in the fortunes of the Raj and its people. The settlement must lay down a scale of allowances for non-ruling members of the family, and it may be over and above its vatans, inams, lands and other private demesnes. Extraordinary emergencies and rare occasions, too, must be provided for in the constitution, on a scale suited to the means and dignity of the State and the nature of the occasions. But it is not needful here to go into any of these details; all I wish to insist on is a recognition and adoption of the princi-

ple of separation between the two departments of the Treasury, and limit to the demand on the State revenues for the private or personal needs and purposes of the ruler and his family. The Raja and his house have, indeed, a clear claim on the income of the *Raj*, because the former is necessary for the existence of the latter, even to a greater degree than the latter is for that of the former; but that claim ought not to be exclusive or forgetful of justice to the tax-payer, or else the very *raison d'être* of the thing ceases to have force; and the king is thus both the master and the servant of the people. The two claims, therefore, must balance each other in fairness; for the true interests of the people and of the rulers are identical, and a sense of justice and regard to mutual wants and circumstances must underlie their relations. This principle then is one of the two main supports of good government and a happy State: the other is the supremacy of law over all individual will and power, which leads to a consideration of the second head mentioned above.

A written code of laws is, indeed, a plain necessity in the management of any territory deserving to be called a State. Rules and instructions are required even in the conduct of any private business or property which has to be managed through agents; a State or Kingdom, therefore, must have a written code of laws above all things. We have now in some of the States such a code, and in others its rudimentary substitute called by the names of *Rasams* or *Sadamat Shirastas* or standing customs; but as laws are sought to be twisted to their ends by parties to a suit, so the precise meaning or even existence of the customs is often called in question. It would therefore be well to have the true import of these customs ascertained by a Commission irrespective of application to any individual cases or dispute, and systematised. They would, then, form a good basis of legislation which could be amended and improved with adaptations from the Shastraic institutes of old and from the laws of British India, so as to supplement what is wanting, and modify what is defective, and refine what is crude and barbarous in the existing arrangements. But great care is necessary to avoid, as far as possi-

ble, the niceties and technicalities of the present British Indian codes which are demoralising its people, and under cover of which lying and dishonesty flourish in luxuriance, and insolvency itself is often used as a cover for living in ease, and litigation nourished to the injury of social peace and of the morals and means of the subjects. Wise legislation ought to aim at discouraging this tendency in human nature as much as possible. An advanced state of society and complicated transactions of trade and business, no doubt, create a necessity for complicated laws, and inevitably lead to the evils referred to ; but Native States ought to guard against them as much as they can and their position permits them to do, and I think this may be effected to a great extent by having a plain and simple code of laws—like the old Elphinstone Code—for all ordinary cases, and leaving questions which could not be decided under it to be settled by a resort to *panchayats* and arbitrators nominated from amongst the business men and experts concerned in each case, and also by reserving power to decide all such cases involving any great principle to a supreme appellate authority which should be created after the manner of the Judicial Committee of the British Privy Council. A remedy like this is likely to keep down vexatious litigation, whereas elaborate technical legislation is sure to act as oil to the burning wick. But the making of laws is not half so important as the observance of them, and to secure this end no one, however highly placed, must be exempted from their operation: the king himself must not be above the law, though he is the first and chief agent for framing and carrying it out ; and when a necessity for action arises, which is not provided for legislatively, a law must be made for it and thus the reign of law must be perpetuated and people taught practically to feel that no one is above the law. Yours, &c.

A POLITICAL RECLUSE.

Letter No. VII.

MAHARAJA,

The next measure for consideration is the *separation of the judicial from the executive offices*. A combination of these functions in the same hands is naturally dangerous to the purity of justice and to the liberty of the subject, and must often interfere with timely despatch of work in some direction or other. The power to prosecute, decide, and execute, when centred in one and the same individual officer, virtually results in making a local despot of him by reducing the checks on or increasing the temptation to his abuse of authority. Individual powers and energy too are limited, and where a multiplicity of functions is combined in one person he has to use deputies, and thus, though the power rests in that one person nominally, a division of labour is inevitable except in very small areas of local administration. To avoid both these evils it is a wiser course to separate the offices than to divide the work in amount and retain them in the same hands, while enough work for an officer might be provided by an extension of his jurisdiction in regard to his own special duties. Again, a man who has only one set of duties to perform gets a facility for their performance, and does them better and quicker than if he has a multiplicity of functions to carry out. The example of the administration of British India in all its varied branches affords such a clear illustration of this principle that it is needless to dwell longer on it. I must not, however, be understood to advocate the extension of this principle all over the areas of administration from top to bottom. In the case of the higher jurisdictions, civil and criminal, it is necessary to carry it out. But in the small rural areas and in the villages elementary magisterial powers may still be vested in the head of the local executive of the government. This might especially be advisable in the Native States, where the administrative organisation is either imperfect or backward

or both, and where, owing to the immemorial existence of despotic rule and absence of recognition of rights in the subject on the part of the rulers, the people are inclined to regard their own interests as always hostile to those of the State, and being ever accustomed to labour for the latter under compulsion, may mistake liberty as a justification for indifference or neglect or even obstruction hurtful to the public service and general welfare. The performance of casual and unimportant but very essential local public business is in such a case likely to suffer or entail a very great amount of public expenditure. This latter must, indeed, mean an additional tax on the people themselves; but they cannot be expected to act on such an analysis anywhere, much less in Native States. A certain degree of discretion may, therefore, be allowed in this matter, and any change must be made cautiously and tentatively. Further the heads of the local executive should be paid so as to be ordinarily above temptation and their work must be constantly under supervision of higher authority, and subject to moral checks and departmental control, though not liable to technical appeal in all cases. I have here roughly, yet I hope sufficiently, indicated the extent of the exception which may be safely made to the general rule of a separation of the judicial from the executive offices.

An audit department as a check on all unauthorised expenditure is necessary in the interests of the State itself. Nothing favours peculation and misappropriation of the public money so much as entrusting one and the same department with the power of collecting taxes, sanctioning or incurring expenditure and keeping accounts. Therefore, this function of keeping accounts and of seeing that no department, however important, and no officer, however exalted, incurs the smallest expenditure that has not been previously sanctioned must be vested in a special department which shall have no hand or part in any branch of the work of administration, and the head of which is subordinate only to the ruling authority. The wisdom of this policy of separation of these different functions carried on by different departments acting

in cordial co-operation with each other and loyal subordination to all constituted authority and to the head of the management, is demonstrated by the British system of administration and is among the most important lessons taught to India by it. It cannot therefore be too early or too faithfully followed, not only in the government of Native States, but also in the conduct of all corporate functions, and all private enterprises and joint undertakings whatsoever. For, it hardly needs to be pointed out that it is this system that enables not only the Government to carry on its work but also private companies successfully to undertake large commercial, agricultural and manufacturing enterprises from head quarters thousands of miles away and with the help mainly of paid agency. Of course, the moral character of the men constituting that agency—their sense of duty and trustworthiness generally—is an important element in the case, but it is equally true that without the help of a proper system even they would not be able to achieve the success they do.

Qualified agency for Public Service, its tenure of office, &c. The necessity of qualification in a Public Service is self-evident, because there is no business, even of a private character, which can be well done by any man who has not acquired some sort of training to enable him to perform it. But what we have to learn from our English friends is the wisdom of their policy in securing along with efficiency the maintenance of a general sense of responsibility and fidelity in the discharge of duties in the members of the Public Services: and these, so far as administrative means are concerned—for, the ultimate basis of success and strength is high-toned public morality combined with public spirit—are generally insured by the two conditions of (1) a certainty of tenure during good behaviour and capacity for work, and (2) a prospect of pension during the period of superannuation as a provision for old age and infirmity. It is these two conditions which attracted thousands upon thousands of the Indian people of all classes and grades to the service, alike in military and in civil departments, of alien rulers, even at a time when physical contact with them was regarded as contamination, and enabled

the latter to acquire, and still helps them to govern their vast dominions from a base more than four thousand miles away. The working of this principle well illustrates the remark made by one of their eloquent and thoughtful historians, which I have already quoted, to the effect that English valour and English intelligence have done less to extend and to preserve their Oriental Empire than English veracity, and that no oath, hostage or fastness imparts that security which is enjoyed by one who is armed with the British guarantee. The remark, it is true, was made directly with reference to politics; but in reality what is said therein about the moral effect of the trust reposed in fidelity to engagements in the political, extended to undertakings in all departments of the State, and the confidence which is thereby created, secured, and still continues to secure, faithfulness in the discharge of public duty of every kind and in every line of work, and this is the reason why even higher paid posts in Native States are not readily accepted unless they are either temporary exchanges for the British service or are in some form or other guaranteed by the British Government. It is an essential part of this system, however, that while efficiency and good behaviour are always allowed their dues, all proved breach of trust and wilful dereliction of duty and commission of wrong are promptly and adequately punished, so that fear of punishment plays therein at least as great a part as the love of reward. This is an old truth. *Manu* in his chapter on Government says:—

“Punishment is an active ruler; he is the true manager of public affairs; he is the dispenser of laws....

“Punishment governs all mankind; punishment alone preserves them; punishment wakes, while their guards are asleep; the wise consider punishment as the perfection of justice.

“When rightly and considerately inflicted, it makes all the people happy; but, inflicted without full consideration, it wholly destroys them all.

“If the king were not, without indolence, to punish the

guilty, the stronger would roast the weaker like fish on a spit.

*

*

*

*

“The whole race of men is kept in order by punishment; for a guiltless man is hard to be found: through fear of punishment, indeed, this universe is enabled to enjoy its blessings.”

Let it not, therefore, be supposed that it is all a trick of administrative skill and policy that effects such a wonder. No. It is the systematic maintenance by means of appropriate rewards and punishments of the claims of right and justice, which the strict observance of official promises implies, that forms the real basis of the strength and success of British rule. It will be found that, in the long run, power waits on moral attributes and far-sighted wisdom and that similarly it decays with the decay of virtue in its possessors. The popular belief, therefore, that a rule betokens the beginning of its end when its representatives, in the hauteur and pride of their physical might, begin to despise and trample right and truth under foot because the aggrieved are too weak to exact justice, is well founded. And by none does this truth need to be more constantly borne in mind than the politicians and rulers of Native States, because the prevalence and success of intrigue or high-handedness or both combined, from above and below, with which they are so unfortunately familiar, and of which they happen to be both victims and authors in turn, are sadly calculated to blind them to it, and the temptation to disregard its stern lesson and to make a short-sighted and easy expediency the rule of conduct is in their case strong and almost irresistible. But I am digressing, and to resume the subject I must pass on to the question of—

A delegation of powers. Along with certainty of tenure and remuneration, it is equally necessary that every office and post from that of the Divan or Minister to the smallest functionary should have its precise power and responsibility defined; for it is only then that responsibility can be properly exacted as it ought to be strictly enforced, and the possession of

responsible authority and the certain knowledge that it will have to be promptly and duly exercised help to secure a faithful discharge of trust and continued efficiency. In many Native States, however, this defect alone is enough to account for a great deal of the looseness which characterises their conduct of affairs ; for, in the absence of defined powers and responsibilities, the biggest official sometimes has to abstain from exercising the smallest power, and as a consequence almost everybody shirks the performance of any duty for which, should it not prove agreeable to the powers that be, he is not sure he may not be taken to task, and yet the performance of which may be essential to the public welfare. Another advantage of the gradation of power and responsibility is that the mistakes to which men are liable in work of the first instance can be rectified by those above them, and that in due course it becomes the prerogative and the privilege of the supreme ruler to eliminate, as far as is given to human agents honestly exercising power to eliminate, all error and injustice and oppression from the administration, and thus make for good government and righteous rule. Officers, however, who are to be entrusted with power must be selected with care. The rank and file must, as a rule, belong to the State, and their nomination be subject to regular tests ; but in making selections for the higher and responsible offices it is necessary to guard against two sorts of people : (1) those who from their position and circumstances would supply an illustration of the phrase that the nose-ring is heavier than the nose, and (2) those likely, from the same influences, to be tempted to make hay while the sun shines. Of course, this is only a general observation, and personal antecedents, character, principles and temperament, which go to counteract the natural inclinations of a class must not be overlooked—especially as it will be long before you can dispense with the necessity of employing in important offices others than your own subjects, and, indeed, in some cases it would be even wise and beneficial to keep up that practice.

It is now time to consider what should be the system of district administration which you ought to adopt, for it is

there that the real merits of a rule are manifested, and its characteristic fruits developed and displayed; but the consideration of this question must stand over for the next.
Yours &c.,

A POLITICAL RECLUSE.

Letter No. VIII.

MAHARAJA,

We have now, in the course of this discussion, arrived at the stage where it is necessary to consider what should be *the system of district administration to be adopted*. This is a matter of the utmost importance, because, as I have remarked at the close of my last letter, it is the nature of its district administration more than anything else that indicates the true character of a rule, and determines the condition of its subjects. Urban populations living usually in compact masses, following independent lines of occupation and possessing worldly means, are surrounded by conditions favourable for the development of intelligence, culture, and public spirit, which may tend to modify within their own limits the legitimate results of the action of a Government ruling over them; but these results show themselves in their true colors in the villages in which all the world over the people live scattered, poor, ignorant, and depending for their weal or woe mainly, if not entirely, on the conduct and policy of their rulers. Hence the solicitude of every wise and enlightened Government ought to be specially devoted to its district administration, which is also the chief basis of its strength.

It is, then, hardly necessary to observe that for the Native States in these times anything having the least approach or semblance to the old custom of farming any portion of the work of administration is out of date and out of the question.

The administration must be all departmental, after the mod of British India. Authority in Native territory generally is often feebly and irregularly enforced, and wherever or whenever it is exerted with persevering strength or energy, it is not from the best or wisest of motives; but in British India it is exercised with uniform strictness, which is necessary to secure efficiency and respect for the law. The law itself may be mild or mildly administered from principle; but there must be no paltering with its execution. Hence the necessity of adopting a machinery which might be depended upon duly to carry out orders and to ensure the maintenance of peace. This virtue the centralised system possesses, because under it even the smallest official feels that he has the strength of the whole Government at his back, and therefore it is that the management of the country by the British succeeded even at a time when their ideas and principles of government differed so much from those of the people they were called upon to rule and they were themselves individually few in number compared with the masses of the latter. But the system has this inherent draw-back that it places much power in the hands of subordinates by whom it is liable to be misused. Centralization, according to the thoughtful author of "*The Original*," has these two vices, that "it must necessarily create a tribe of subordinate traders in government, who, with whatever English feelings they might set out, must, from the nature of things, they or their successors, become arbitrary, vexatious and selfish," and that it deprives "the citizens of the invigorating moral exercise of managing their common affairs." Now, if this be true to any extent of Englishmen and of England, the children and the home of liberty, how much more must it be so in India, where, according to immemorial usage, check on the use or abuse of power proceeds only from the goodness of him who wields it and not because of the existence of rights in the subject or of the restriction proceeding from that principle? The subordinates therefore have here special opportunities to misbehave. But as there is no system which is not open to some objection or other, wisdom consists in adopting the one which contains the greatest good, providing remedies against the abuse to which

it is liable. Even in the management of private business, constant care has to be taken to prevent misconduct or breach of trust. Much more effort, therefore, is needed to watch over the concerns of a people and the affairs of a Government. Superior officers must look after the conduct of their subordinates, while, on the other hand, the people themselves must be no less watchful of their own interests, remembering that violence to the rights of the smallest member of society, if tolerated and acquiesced in for any time, must sooner or later result in the invasion of the rights of or injury to the whole. Solon, the famous Greek law-giver and wise man, summed up the whole principle of liberty in one small sentence, when, being asked how men could be most effectually deterred from committing injustice, replied: "If those who are not injured feel as much indignation as those who are." Hence, "freedom like health can only be preserved by exercise," "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty"—these are among the maxims which are avowed by and guide the daily conduct of people who are anxious to protect themselves from official oppression or wrong, and those who wish to reap the fruits of such wise maxims must follow their example. The task devolves primarily on the men of means and leisure, intelligence and public spirit; but to be successful in their efforts they must have the countenance and support of the community generally.

You must then adopt the departmental system, because it is the only efficient method of carrying on the work of administration, but at the same time you must guard against the evil to which it is characteristically prone and for checking which the Native States possess some facilities which are wanting in British India. For instance, their areas are small and can, therefore, be supervised more easily. Again, in British India the ruling class are separated from the ruled by a wide social gulf, in consequence of which matters which are fully talked about and believed in among the latter are unknown to the former and even when they are reported to them in some shape they do not find easy credence; whereas, in spite of all their differences of creeds and castes, there is no social chasm nor much diversity of language between the rulers of Native States

and their subjects and in this fact they possess an advantage which can be utilized for the purpose referred to. There the humblest subject can speak to the highest authority with a confidence and a certainty of being understood or at any rate of not being misunderstood. This, I believe, is the probable explanation of the spirited bearing which H. R. H. the Prince of Wales is said, during his tour in India in 1875-76, to have observed in the people of the Native States as contrasted with those of British India ; for, being unconscious of the existence of any social distance or separation between themselves and their rulers, the subjects of the former would naturally feel more self-possessed than those of the latter. On the other hand, British India enjoys a constitutional government and safeguards of liberty to which the meanest can appeal for protection against the most exalted personage but which the Native States totally lack. Under the shelter, however, of the great advantage of social solidarity with their subjects which the Native Princes possess, it would be possible for them to remove the chief defect of their rule and construct a system of local administration tolerably free from the drawback attaching to centralized authority. The essential features of such a system must be, on the one hand, a close and constant supervision of the subordinates from above. There should be no judicial ignorance of, or neglect to inquire into, wrongful practices which give clear indications of their existence, and anybody found guilty of corrupt or oppressive behaviour must be sternly dealt with and made an example of. On the other hand, as much of the administration as is possible with safety to all interests must be placed under the influence of the people themselves. To indicate what might be the general character of the arrangement, I quote from the authority cited in my second letter the following brief but clear description of the English system :—

“In England we have self-government without autonomy—Acts of Parliament rule and overrule every detail of the administration, but the administration is not carried out by a bureaucracy ; it is left to a variety of local bodies to carry out the laws. These local bodies, however, have no legislative

functions. In England, we have the maximum of legislative centralisation with a minimum of bureaucratic centralisation and of autonomy. The administration is carried on by the people themselves, but it is carried on without autonomy on lines laid down by the central legislature. There are no inferior legislative bodies with independent powers. A strong legislative centralisation is quite compatible with delegation of administrative powers to local bodies, subject to carry out what the law prescribes, and unable to follow their own inclinations or to wander outside a strictly defined legal sphere. The results of this system are general respect for the law based on general understanding of law, as all classes of the community are called upon to join in its execution, absence of conflict between the central law and the laws promulgated by other legislative units, absence of bureaucracy except for the highest Imperial concerns."

Put in for 'Acts of Parliament' your own Laws and Regulations, such as they are or might be made, and also substitute the word "State" for "Imperial" in the above passage, and you have in a small compass a pretty clear idea of what sort of a system the Native States might aim at constructing for carrying on the district administration of their territories. Even then, of course, the passage quoted must be taken to indicate the general lines and not to lay down the details of the plan to be adopted; the principles it explains have to be applied, as far as possible, to the circumstances and requirements of each State and the capacities of its people.

Now, it might perhaps be thought that the model thus set forth is British and not British Indian, but I recommend it not in any spirit of imitation, because I am not for imitating any form which does not bring with it the substance. Nor am I one of those who hate every custom or institution because it is foreign and admire or seem to love it simply because it is indigenous. It is not such prejudices, but the soundness and justice or otherwise of the principles involved and their suitability to times and circumstances, that ought to be held to decide in such cases. The Native States, being under home

rule, to that extent resemble England rather than British India, and, therefore, I think they might conduct their local affairs *so far as may be practicable* on the English model. Again, in recommending such a course, it might be similarly remarked, that I was treating, with unmerited neglect a more efficacious basis in our ancient village system, which it is often asserted contained the true germ of local self-government or representative institutions. I, however, humbly think on the contrary that this village system has been over-praised and credited with virtues that did not belong to it, and held guiltless of evils which are clearly traceable to its influence. Indeed, so far from proving the germ of local self-government, that time-honoured system did not even pave the way for the introduction of the present municipal institutions which had to be gradually forced on the people by the British Government, as a glance at the course of its legislation on the subject will show. The truth is the village system is not an exclusively Indian institution. For, in the absence of a generally settled order of things, and of a stable and all-pervading government, to which men must look up for justice and protection—and this condition was universal in the old world, and even now it is not extinct—some arrangement like the village system could not but spring into existence if any society which had passed beyond the primitive stage was to hold together at all; and accordingly village communities managing their local affairs have existed in all countries, in the East and West, but not necessarily as elective or representative institutions. Indeed, even Russia, barbarous and despotic as she has been held to be, had and still has in its *Mir* a complete village organisation, which must be considered to be superior to the Indian village society, inasmuch as the former is said, unlike the latter, to afford the freest scope to individual liberty of action to its members. I, therefore, do not think much of the inherent merits of the village system as generating or even encouraging the spirit of self-government, although in times of old it may have proved an efficient instrument in the management of local public affairs. The learned author of “Ancient Law,” whose researches into

the subject are well-known, observes, in Lecture IV, pp. 122-5 of his "Village Communities in the East and West," (second edition):—

"India has nothing answering to the assembly of adult males which is so remarkable a feature of the ancient Teutonic groups, except the council of village elders. It is not universally found. Villages frequently occur in which the affairs of the community are managed, its customs interpreted and the disputes of its members decided by a single Headman whose office is sometimes admittedly hereditary, but is sometimes described as elective; the choice being generally, however, in the last case confined in practice to the members of one particular family, with a strong preference for the eldest male of the kindred, if he be not specially disqualified. But I have good authority for saying, that, in those parts of India in which the village community is most perfect and in which there are the clearest signs of an original proprietary, equality between all the families composing the group, the authority exercised elsewhere by the Headman is lodged with the village Council. It is always viewed as a representative body, and not as a body possessing inherent authority, and whatever be its real number it always bears a name which recalls its ancient constitution of five persons.

"I shall have hereafter to explain that, though there are strong general resemblances between the Indian village communities wherever they are found in anything like completeness, they prove, on close inspection, to be not simple but composite bodies, including a number of classes with very various rights and claims. One singular proof of this variety of interests, and at the same time of the essentially representative character of the village Council, is constantly furnished, I am told, by a peculiar difficulty of the Anglo-Indian functionary when engaged in 'settling' a province in which the native condition of society has been but little broken up. The village Council, if too numerous, is sure to be unmanageable; but there is great pressure from all sections of the community to be represented in it, and it is practically hard

to keep its numbers down. The evidence of the cultivators as to custom does not point, I am told, to any uniform mode of representation; but there appears to be a general admission that the members of the Council should be elderly men. No example of village or of district government recalling the Teutonic assembly of free adult males has been brought to my notice. While I do not affect to give any complete explanation of this, it may be proper to remember that, though no country was so perpetually scourged with war as India before the establishment of the Pax Britannica, the people of India were never a military people. Nothing is told of them resembling that arming of an entire society which was the earliest, as it is the latest, phase of Teutonic history. No rule can be laid down of so vast a population without exceptions. The Mahratta brigands when they first rose against the Mahometans were a Hindu hill-tribe armed to a man; and before the province of Oudh was annexed, extreme oppression had given an universally military character to a naturally peaceful population. But for the most part, the Indian village communities have always submitted without resistance to monarchs surrounded by mercenary armies. The causes, therefore, which in primitive societies give importance to young men in the village assembly were wanting. The soldiers of the community had gone abroad for mercenary service, and nothing was required of the council but experience and civil wisdom."

This, I believe, is a brief but pretty exhaustive description of the nature of the Indian village system, and is the utmost that can be urged in favour of it. The absence of a general arming of the population, in spite of the perpetual scourge of war afflicting the land, and the submission of the village communities to tyranny practised by kings surrounded by mercenary troops, at which the author justly expresses surprise, because the country has always teemed with population, are, however, explained by the fact that the caste system through its sharp division of labour made fighting the occupation of one section of the people alone and reduced the rest to a helpless, indeed to an abject, condition. The exceptions to

this rule noticed in the extract were due to the necessity for mere self-preservation, when it was endangered by extreme persecution or oppression as in the case of the Sikhs, the Marathas and the people of Oudh. These exceptions were individual in their nature, and consequently they were temporary and local. Beyond this most indirect reflection, however, there is no mention made here of any other demerit of the institution. On this point I have to add a remark or two which must stand over for my next. Yours &c.

A POLITICAL RECLUSE.

Letter No. IX.

MAHARAJA,

I have said in my last that the Indian village system has been held up to praises it did not deserve, and that its serious defects have been little recognised. The alleged merits of the system could not probably be expressed with greater force than in this eloquent language of Sir C. T. Metcalfe:—

“ The village communities are little republics, having nearly everything they can want within themselves, and almost independent of any foreign relations. They seem to last where nothing else lasts. Dynasty after dynasty tumbles down; revolution succeeds to revolution; Hindn, Pathan, Mogul, Mahratta, Sikh, English, are all masters in turn; but the village community remains the same. In times of trouble they arm and fortify themselves : an hostile army passes through the country : the village community collect their cattle within their walls, and let the enemy pass unprovoked. If plunder and devastation be directed against themselves and the force employed be irresistible, they flee to friendly villagers at a distance; but, when the storm has passed over, they return and resume their occupations. If a country remain for a series of years the scene of continued pillage and massacre, so that the

villages cannot be inhabited, the scattered villagers, nevertheless, return whenever the power of peaceable possession revives. A generation may pass away, but the succeeding generation will return. The sons will take the places of their fathers; the same site for the village, the same position for the houses, the same lands will be re-occupied by the descendants of those who were driven out when the village was depopulated; and it is not a trifling matter that will drive them out, for they will often maintain their post through times of disturbance and convulsion, and acquire strength sufficient to resist pillage and oppression with success. This union of the village communities, each one forming a separate little state in itself, has, I conceive, contributed more than any other cause to the preservation of the people of India, through all the revolutions and changes which they have suffered, and is in a high degree conducive to their happiness and to the enjoyment of a great portion of freedom and independence."

And this is the view generally held; but with all deference to the great authority on which it rests, I cannot help feeling that it is not a correct one: in fact, it seems to me to reverse the position of cause and effect. If it be true indeed that the village system of India contributed to the preservation of its people amidst the succession of wars and revolutions through which the country has passed, it must be remembered that at the same time it equally tended to expose them to those calamities with all their disastrous consequences. For, it is because of the peculiarly isolating influence of this institution and of their strict division into unchangeable castes and occupations that the people became indifferent and apathetic to all but their village affairs, devoid of any public spirit or concern for public as distinguished from purely parochial interests, and consequently incapable of conceiving public duties or forming defensive combinations or organisations on an extended scale to which their own vast numbers so well invited them. Thus was any fear or possibility of a general rising or arming of the population against a foreign invader effectually prevented, and thus was drawn towards it conqueror after conqueror and revolution followed revolution. The villages, so long as they

themselves individually were safe, cared not for what the invaders or his foreign or domestic enemies did with him who was their sovereign for the time being or with the rest of the country, and they even supplied him with mercenaries to serve as the instruments of his despotism while he was in possession of power. The Indian village system, therefore, while it enabled the people to live amidst wars and revolutions, also stood in the way of those obstacles against these dire occurrences which the country as a whole prompted by the natural love of independence might otherwise have put forth. This serious demerit of the institution is thus noticed by Gleig in his "History of India," Volume I, pages 47-48:—

“ A striking and, to a certain extent at least, a mischievous effect of the village system of Hindustan was to stifle altogether that love of country which we are accustomed to dignify with the appellation of patriotism. Leave him in possession of the farm which his forefathers owned and preserve entirely the institutions to which he had from infancy been accustomed, and the simple Hindu would give himself no concern whatever as to the intrigues and cabals which took place at the capital. Dynasties might displace one another; revolutions might occur; and the persons of his sovereign might change everyday; but so long as his own little society remained undisturbed, all other contingencies were to him subjects scarcely of speculation. To this, indeed, more than to any other cause, is to be ascribed the facility with which one conqueror after another has overrun different parts of India; which submitted, not so much because its inhabitants were wanting in courage, as because to the great majority among them it signified nothing by whom the reins of the supreme government were held.”

This, I think, must be allowed to be a sounder view to take of the subject, and it was thus the Indian area of patriotism came to be confined, at first, to one's village, and, then, to one's family, and through strict heredity of occupation and interdiction on inter-marriage, to one's caste; and these two institutions would appear to have contributed to the destruction

of anything like public spirit among the people to a greater degree than any other cause or causes put together. The effect could not escape the observation of intelligent strangers. Ninety years ago, Colonel Arthur Wellesly and Major Thomas Munro who were serving in India, though not yet known to their future fame, were corresponding with each other on the desirability of extending British dominion in this country; and the former writing to the latter on the subject said:—"As for the wishes of the people, particularly in this country, I put them out of the question. They are the only philosophers about their governors that ever I met with—if indifference constitutes that character." Thirty years later, Mountstuart Elphinstone, who accepts Metcalfe's view of our village system, however, in his account of the Indian character, makes this remark:—"The villagers are everywhere amiable and affectionate to their families, kind to their neighbours and towards all, *but the Government*, honest and sincere." I underline those three words. An institution which leads a people to look upon the character of the Government that rules over their destinies with indifference and apathy, if not with dislike or hatred, without at the same time moving them even in their dreams to oppose or correct any of its evil ways, cannot but be considered inherently vicious. How noble by contrast with this teaching appears the motto of William Penn that "*a man should make it part of his religion to see that his country is well governed?*" The villages thus destroyed the country and could realise no public interests beyond their immediate concerns within their own respective limits; and what genuine fellow-feeling and public life could have been cultivated within these limits would appear to have been prevented by the rules of caste, which obliged men to withhold their sympathies from their next-door neighbours and reserve them for distant people with whom alone they could associate or intermarry. Is it a wonder that a people nurtured under such influences should not be remarkable for a pervading sense of public duty, a regard for political rights or the value of official integrity, and concern or readiness of self-sacrifice for the general good?

Equal with the political, if not still greater, has been the injury done to the country socially and morally by this village system. For it combined in itself all the blighting elements of temporal tyranny and sacerdotal despotism, and embodied their essence in the baneful maxim so eminently calculated to repress all originality of thought, of moral vigor and independence and force of character, to arrest progress, and to pave the way to national weakness and degradation: the maxim *vis*: “ *Yadyapi sudham lokaviruddham, nâkara-niyam nâcharaniyam*, which, of course, means that even if correct in itself, a course which is opposed to the popular view should never be accepted or followed; and, enforcing this fatal precept with the remorseless instrument of civil death, it effectually crushed out all life and produced in the name of order the stillness of dormancy, if not death, in which the country has long stagnated—a result to which the modern system of caste has silently contributed its due share, as it is, while tolerating abuses, still checking all conscious and real progress. Truth itself must be powerless before such a deadly combination. For, nowhere can the popular mind be enlightened all at once on any subject, and in such a case error must be simply long-lived. A very trite example will suffice. Astronomy was early cultivated in this country, and centuries ago the true cause of the eclipses was discovered; but the genius who made the discovery with very indifferent helps, when only remonstrated with on his heresy by his priestly brethren, so far from insisting on the assertion of his precious truth, yielded at once to their ignorant superstition and freely avowed that *their* monsters, *Rahu* and *Ketu*, became for the moment the shadows in the sky which *he* found to cause the phenomena. Under this subtle timidity the discovery was buried as soon as it was made; and to this day not only the multitudes of ignorant men and women, but even the educated fraternity from the humble school-boy to the exalted legislator or scholar who can in the class rooms and public halls demonstrate the scientific causes of the eclipses, fast and bathe on the occasions as if they thought, like some ignorant savages, that unearthly beings were trying to swallow up the orb of day or night and casting gloom and impurity on mankind below! Of course, the excuse is that it is the uneducated

women and priests who compel this sorry observance against clear convictions of the natural truth; but what should keep such precious members as the women and priests of a cultured society in a mental condition on a par with their menial servants but obedience to the great maxim already quoted? How could any progress or reform be expected to make head where every innovator was sure to be smothered like the struggling fly within the spider's net? British rule with its liberty of action checked this repressive force to some extent and the salutary impulse derived from English education led a few great spirits to start new movements which have been followed more or less feebly by a comparatively small number of congenial minds, but the great majority even now receive them with a logic in which assumption does duty for fact, prejudice for argument and passion for appeal. Thus, in spite of progressive education and enlightenment are perpetuated hurtful errors, degrading superstitions and baneful customs and institutions, and yet their vitality is assumed to follow from their sound basis and regarded as a matter of congratulation. Of submission to the inevitable, especially when associated with worldly advantages even when opposed to the aforesaid maxim or some other belief, there is not much lack and the resulting sense of violated conviction is satisfied with some sort of easy penance; but such submission is far from a virtue and brings on weakness and degeneracy of spirit instead of strength. Indeed, the general want of manliness and backbone among the people which is now and then brought out may not incorrectly be ascribed to this national habit of paltering with principle.

There is still another evil which also appears to be traceable to the same cause, and that is what in France is called the 'one man power.' Under the village order of things, the Patel or the Mukhi is the king—the only cock on the dunghill—who can brook no rival near the throne, though every one would aspire to the place which must descend to his son and in a few years become a bone of contention amongst many heirs. The village system was but an assemblage of diverse hereditary functionaries, who carried on their respective duties in accordance with standing usages or the decision of the headman or

council of elders in case of dispute; and, therefore, there was little room in it for intelligent subordination or loyal co-operation. So ingrained and general has been the love of personal rule produced by this ancient 'germ of representative institutions' that it did not as was observed in my last create a demand even for *municipal* self-government, but on the other hand it seems to have effectually banished from the popular mind all idea of co-ordinate or corporate action, and substituted for it an inordinate love of authority, and the result is that, even among those who have received an English education and are imbued with a love of the free political institutions of Europe, the strange spectacle is seen of every one wishing to rule and none inclined to obey—every one laying down plans and none executing them—as also of mutual jealousy and desire for superiority over others on almost all occasions; and yet strangely enough, with all this impatience of outward restraint, they are unable to shake off the degrading bondage of senseless or baneful customs and practices, although their numbers in each caste are now so large that they could act up to their convictions even without any violence to that institution: but everybody waits for everybody else to begin, and only discounts the examples which happen to be already set as an excuse for doing nothing himself.*

Such, in my humble judgment, are among the evil legacies of the village system and they promise little or no aid to self-government or to any joint work at all. If, in these circumstances, I suggest to you, Maharaja, the advisability of framing your district administration on popular lines, it is not because any hopes can be based on the development of the old village system, but because of the moral basis of the institution of *Panchayat* which depends for its general acceptance on the agency of personal character and qualification more than mere birth or hereditary position in the performance of civic business carried on under the eye, as it were,

* An analysis into the deeper causes of this phenomenon does not appertain to the subject in hand and will not therefore be attempted here; but such an inquiry ought to prove very instructive to all friends of genuine progress among the people in all lines of national life.

of the local public of each place, and therefore within the ken of all interested in its proper and honest execution. Disinterested public services of this kind must be encouraged and rewarded with social honours and personal distinctions.

This, then, is the principle—and the basis of it lies in human nature more than in any local custom or institution—which must be made use of in constructing local organisations for the management of local affairs. Responsibility for the State dues, management of the local police and liability to make good losses caused by thefts occurring within local limits, award of punishment for petty offences, decision of civil disputes by arbitration in the first instance and even absolutely in cases where possible, provision of means with the help of the State for carrying out schemes of local utility and local purposes, such as sanitation in all branches, construction and repairs of wells and temples, charities, ceremonies, amusements &c., may, as of old, be the objects, but some departure must be made in the mode of their local administration. The institution and encouragement of such local organisations are to be desired not for the fashion of the thing, but because they conduce to beneficial ends: they practically educate and interest the people in public business and range them on the side of peace, law and order, and thus attach them to the central authority—the Government—in due relation; they save a great deal of expense and trouble to the latter which, in other words, means the people themselves; and, lastly, they serve to bring out facts of first instance in as little official antagonism as possible, and leave to the central Government the easier task of deciding only the application of law and principle to all disputes. The last is not the least advantage, as it reduces all friction to a minimum, and must together with the rest be productive of public benefit and content to a far greater extent than any other course is calculated to lead to. How to construct the requisite system is a problem for each State to solve for itself: but some hints of possible use as to both principle and detail might be obtained by a study of similar institutions in other countries. I will here reproduce a suggestive passage or two from “*The Original*” which has been cited in my last:—

“The machinery, by which alone this desirable end can be accomplished, must consist of local governments so ordered that those who are most successful in the honourable conduct of their own concerns, would be selected, and being selected, would be willing to give up time sufficient to superintend the affairs of their respective communities. Now this can only be permanently effected by making government a social and convivial affair—a point of interesting union to the men most deserving the confidence of their fellow citizens.

“Under such circumstances, the expense of government might be greater than at present, but the expense of want of government would assuredly be more than proportionately less, and the state of society would be healthy and constantly improving.

* * * * *

“It is by the principles alone of self-government by small communities that a nation can be brought to enjoy a vigorous moral health, and its consequence—real prosperity. It is by the same principle alone that the social feelings can be duly called into action, and that men, taken in the mass, can be noble, generous, intelligent, and free.”

Of equal importance is the nature of the relations which should subsist between the Central Government and the Local Bodies, and on this point I will adduce a few general remarks from “The English Citizen Series—Local Government” by Mr. M. D. Chalmers. Regarding the necessity of a guiding and controlling central authority—which everywhere is as a matter of course superior in intelligence and knowledge to the rural localities but the total absence of which was the great defect of the Indian village system—the author quotes this dictum as laid down in the report of the Royal Sanitary Commission of 1869:—

“However local the administration of affairs, a central authority will nevertheless be always necessary in order to keep the local executive everywhere in action—to aid it when higher skill or information is needed, and to carry out numerous functions of central superintendence. * * * There should be one recognised and sufficiently powerful mini-

ster, not to centralise administration, but, on the contrary, to set local life in motion a real motive power, and an authority to be referred to for guidance and assistance by all the sanitary authorities for local government throughout the country. Great is the *vis inertiae* to be overcome ; the repugnance to self-taxation ; the practical distrust of science ; and the number of persons interested in offending against sanitary laws, even amongst those who must constitute chiefly the local authorities to enforce them."

The book concludes with these observations :—

"‘Power’, says Mr. J. S. Mill, ‘may be localised, but knowledge to be most useful must be centralised. There must be somewhere a focus at which all its scattered rays are collected, that the broken and coloured lights which exist elsewhere may find there what is necessary to complete and purify them. The Central Authority ought to keep open a perpetual communication with the localities, informing itself by their experience, and them by its own, giving advice freely when asked and volunteering it when it seems to be required.’ At any rate until our rural system of local government is better organised, the ratepayers will be grateful for the central audit; but the extent of the administrative control that the Central Government should exercise is a most difficult problem. Obedience to the general laws which the Legislature has laid down for the preservation of private and individual rights and the limitation of the power of local authorities, can be enforced by the courts of law ; but how far ought local bodies to be allowed to mismanage their own affairs? If they are superintended by an intelligent and conscientious central department, armed with large executive powers, it is apt to err on the side of undue interference. When it sees things going wrong it steps in with a high hand to set them right. Yet it is only by a succession of tumbles that a child can learn to walk. A local authority in leading strings is not likely to learn aright the lesson of self-government. If local autonomy possesses the political value its admirers assert for it, it may be well worth while to make some temporary sacrifices to develop and strengthen it. In local matters ‘that which is best adminis-

tered' may not be 'best' in the long run. The tendency to regard all England as a suburb of London is certainly not a healthy one. Anything that can give vigour and colour to local life should be encouraged. In the case of local bodies, as in the case of individuals, it may be better and healthier to be too little governed than to be too much governed, even though the government be good. 'The* difficulty is to promulgate only the necessary laws; to remain ever faithful to the truly constitutional principle of society, to put oneself on guard against the fury of the Governor, the most fatal malady of modern Governments'."

It will probably be long before the conditions dwelt on in this passage will be fully realised in Native States or even in British India; but the passage ought to prove very suggestive as to what should be done, and what avoided. No mere paper constitution will serve any useful purpose, and I do not at all suggest one. What you must do is to take up each village and township, and wherever the necessary material exists, give to each the necessary local powers fully covered by local responsibility; leave the rest to the supervision of a properly constituted central office; but where there is no desire or intelligence on the part of the people to undertake the duty, leave your official agency to carry on both the local work and the supervision, with the prospect of a transfer of the former to local hands whenever a desire for it among the people themselves clearly manifests itself. Thus the work may go on quietly and by calling up the powers of the people tend to progressiveness; and this is all that a Raja need or can do to give a healthy shape to the district administration of his State, for thereby he would be just to his subjects and just to himself, and give to the former good government and at the same time provide for their advancement in local self-management which is alike beneficial to them and to him, and therefore to the entire State. Yours &c.

A POLITICAL RECLUSE.

* Quoted in the original from Mirabeau l'Aine, sur l' Education Publique, and here rendered into English.

Letter No. X.

MAHARAJA,

Any the most elementary scheme of administration of a State must have a central authority to direct and regulate its course, remove its difficulties, remedy its defects and settle ever-recurring questions, whether of a general or individual character, and thus ensure the successful working of the entire machinery. Much more, therefore, must such a need arise in the case of the system contemplated herein, with its laws and regulations, separation of offices, delegation of powers and other measures previously described. Now, this central authority must take the form of a body which might be well called the *Cabinet Council*, composed of the heads of all departments with the Raja as its President and the Dewan or the Premier and head of the executive as Vice-President. In all executive matters a final appeal must lie to the Raja and all measures of general applicability passed by the Council must be submitted for his confirmation before they are permitted to take effect.

To this Council solely, in the present state of things, must appertain the function of making laws and regulations ; but, as has been observed in a previous letter, over-legislation must be carefully avoided and no law or enactment made unless its necessity is clearly perceived. Further, in any case of a proposed law, objections and suggestions which may be urged by the people through their representatives in the public assembly (to be presently mentioned) must be duly heard and taken into consideration. The same course must be followed with regard to the levy of any new tax or taxes, and every tax, law, or measure passed by the Council must, as already intimated, receive your confirmation and assent before it comes into operation. This giving of formal assent is a prerogative of the ruling authority, without whose sanction no law should be brought into force, but the form, too, is not without its use

and significance even where the executive authority itself proposed the measure or is otherwise concerned in passing it. It indicates that the sovereign is the source of all legislation, and thus serves as a recognition of that principle; and moreover it is useful as a reminder to the sovereign that he is responsible for all laws. Again, every measure should be carefully considered from all points of view and made as unexceptionable as it can be *before* it comes into force; but it is not always possible to anticipate every objection, and occasionally some serious defect or flaw may be discovered immediately after it has passed through the final stage. In such cases the assent is withheld and the law returned for amendment, and thus what is usually a mere formality serves to obviate a practical difficulty. While on this subject, I may in passing observe that, in view of the demands of an improved system of administration and of the necessity for the advancement of education, of arts and industries and other measures for promoting the welfare and happiness of the people, no taxation should be lightly remitted unless it be found by its very nature to be harassing in its mode of assessment and collection, or really injurious in its economic effects on the condition of the subjects. Purity of the public service, and through it of the public administration too, demands that it be adequately remunerated. High salaries alone, it is true, will not suffice to keep any set of officials free from corruption. I have in a previous letter mentioned that an intelligent Raja, when he was asked to increase the scale of pay of his public servants as a means of keeping them above temptation and thus prevent their oppression of his subjects, replied that it was no use his doing so as they would receive the higher rates of pay from him and carry on their exactions from the ryots all the same. And he was right in his view, because no other reform was suggested to him along with enhanced remuneration of the services; but this last is one essential means along with others for ensuring the purity of the public administration, and it must cost money. Then, again, there are many other public needs and measures of public usefulness, which must also entail heavy charge on the public treasury. Now, it must not be forgotten that the people who would welcome these boons would by no means always welcome the imposition of taxes which

alone could supply the necessary funds. Therefore, no existing source of income should be given up except for the two reasons already mentioned, and they should be clearly ascertained. Paternal consideration, also, may well be shown to the ryot in the assessment and realisation of the public dues generally, and especially on occasions of difficulties created by natural causes, so as to avoid unequal pressure and rigour. For, after all, the people's wealth and prosperity are the ultimate assets of the Government and the State, and any measure which tends to their preservation or increase must add to its resources and serve also to create and maintain for it a reserve to fall back upon in case of emergencies; but for administrative reasons the abandonment of a tax must be considered as serious a measure as the levy of one, and neither step ought to be taken lightly and without the most careful consideration of all circumstances connected with it and all its probable consequences. Large and permanent public works of a reproductive nature, however, ought not to be constructed out of current taxation alone, and it should be largely supplemented by public loans, so that the cost of the undertakings may be spread over a long period and recouped in light instalments from the many generations who are to enjoy their benefits in the future. But borrowing is a device for raising money which from its apparent ease almost always leads to waste and extravagance and must therefore be resorted to with caution and as a rule only in the case of reproductive works.

Here, though not quite in the order originally indicated, may be noticed the subject of *Finance* and the *Annual Report*. Finance indeed is the backbone of a State and no difficulties it may have to encounter can be compared with the troubles and dangers which have their root in disordered finances. This fact has been so well established by experience both here and elsewhere that little need be said in favour of their sound and careful management. The two great helps to such management are accurate accounts of past years and a tolerably reliable forecast of the income and liabilities of the coming twelve month, in the absence of which the ablest ruler can only grope in the dark and unconsciously tread on pitfalls

except of course where the efficiency of the public administration is held to be a matter of little or no consequence. With the audit and other departments in fair working order no difficulty whatever ought to be experienced in securing these helps ; and a summary of the figures together with the leading facts of the administration should be published in an annual report, which should inform both the people and those who rule over them in what direction and manner the vessel of State is steering ; what are its needs and requirements ; and how they may best be met. The regularity, punctuality and correctness with which these results of the year's working of the administrative machinery can be furnished to the public will afford no small proof of the efficiency of the different departments which compose it and of the satisfaction they are capable of giving to the subjects, and this is a point which should always be kept in view by the supervising authorities.

The last and the highest form of the central authority must be a *Privy Council* to review and supervise the work of the administration from the standpoint of the highest knowledge, wisdom, statesmanship and breadth and liberality of view, which the resources of the State can command. The Privy Council ought, therefore, to be composed of the wisest and best men available in the State, and even outside it ; for I see not only no harm but much social and moral benefit in the Indian Rajas offering to men of light and leading, of moral and social weight and position in British territory, honourable seats on their Privy Councils. Such appointments seem to me to be not ill calculated to bring about a fusion of the sentiments, ideas and practices obtaining in the two sets of administration, which cannot but react beneficially, in however small a degree, on both and favour the cause of progress. The whole Privy Council which would include the Cabinet members will attend in response to a summons whenever some question of exceptional importance has to be considered and its advice thereon is desired : but ordinarily only the official portion of it will work and for that purpose it must be divided into as many committees as the nature of the work of final appeal and supervision it will have to do will require. It will, however, suffice for all practical

purposes to have a judicial and a general committee, the former of which will decide questions of law and justice, and the latter attend to a review and supervision of all the rest of the field of administration and the issue of orders and instructions for the correction of abuses or the introduction of reform wherever they may be called for.

With the aid of arrangements like these, Maharaja, you ought to be able to raise yourself above the details of the administration, and at the same time to improve its tone and strengthen your own control over it by adding to the thoroughness and the beneficial character of your supervision. Freedom from the worry of administrative details is, indeed, a privilege of the highest ruler as a comprehensive supervision and an inspiring direction of the machinery of government is his duty; but while many a Raja freely avails himself of this *privilege* of his position, very few are alive to their *responsibility* which they think is well discharged vicariously by a Dewan or full power minister and his subordinates acting as best they can or will, except where the master may feel personally interested in interfering. One cause of the prevalence of this unfortunate condition of things undoubtedly is the absence of all constitutional arrangements and reliable helps, so that a Raja who may really wish not to shirk his duty is obliged to work very hard, to attend to every measure at every stage, see everything with his own eyes, and thus sacrifice his health and comfort, whereas under even a tolerable system, the task of administration would wear a much less repulsive or harassing aspect and bring the higher powers and the nobler side of the ambition of the ruler into honorable and beneficent play. You, Maharaja, must therefore so arrange your administration that you could always stand aloof from its details and reserve your governance for the higher purpose of direction and supervision, and to this end, in the words of a wise counsellor, "preserve the rights of inferior place and think it more honor to direct in chief than to be busy in all." This course would conduce not only to practical convenience and to economy of precious time and of still more precious health and energy but serve also to further a still higher purpose. All work of first instance,—such is human weakness,—

is almost always liable to mistakes and errors, even when performed by men free from carelessness or corrupt motives ; and these mistakes and errors are more discernible to an onlooker. Hence arises the necessity and also the value of the provision for appeals. Now, the king being the highest court of appeal in the State, it is his privilege and his prerogative to detect and remove all errors and faults in its government, and thus advance the cause of right and justice and keep up the purity of the administration. To ensure that result, therefore, you must on all occasions and in all cases, which call for the exercise of that exalted prerogative, provide yourself with the most efficient helps available and be surrounded by the best influences, and carefully guard against any sinister or misleading factors entering into your deliberation, or contributing to its results at any time.

But, under a constituted order of things like the one suggested above, would not the Raja's occupation, like Othello's, be gone or his prestige and authority weakened ? I believe, on the contrary, that, if, as an old and shrewdly conceived maxim has it, *obedience is the essence of rule*, they will both be strengthened, and, therefore, the most ardent lover of the exercise of power among your brethren need entertain no misgiving on that point excepting of course indulgence in mere caprices ; but as such indulgence in the end benefits no more its author than its victims, the exception hardly needs to be considered. Further, let us look at a typical case on the other side. The Government of England is a limited monarchy, and the authority of its sovereign is so hedged in by laws and restrictions of the popular will and opinion as to make him appear to people generally a mere ornamental figure-head with the least power of any ruler on earth. Yet one of its most eminent prime-ministers, with more than half a century's practical experience of political life, thus describes the position of that sovereign (*Gleanings of Past Years*, Vol. I, pages 41-43):—

“ Although the admirable arrangements of the Constitution have now completely shielded the Sovereign from personal responsibility, they have left ample scope for the exercise of a direct and personal influence in the whole work of government.

The amount of that influence must vary greatly, according to character, to capacity, to experience in affairs, to tact in the application of a pressure which never is to be carried to extremes, to patience in keeping up the continuity of a multitudinous supervision, and, lastly, to close presence at the seat of government ; for, in many of its necessary operations, time is the most essential of all elements, and the most scarce. Subject to the range of these variations, the Sovereign, as compared with his Ministers, has, because he is the Sovereign, the advantages of long experience, wide survey, elevated position, and entire disconnection from the bias of party. * * *

“ Little are they who gaze from without upon long trains of splendid equipages rolling towards a palace conscious of the meaning and the force that live in the forms of a Monarchy, probably the most ancient, and certainly the most solid and the most revered, in all Europe. The acts, the wishes, the example, of the Sovereign in this country are a real power. An immense reverence and a tender affection await upon the person of the one permanent and ever faithful guardian of the fundamental conditions of the Constitution. He is the symbol of law ; he is by law, and setting apart the metaphysics, and the abnormal incidents, of revolution, the source of power. Parliaments and Ministries pass, but he abides in life-long duty ; and he is to them as the oak in the forest is to the annual harvest in the field. When the august functions of the Crown are irradiated by intelligence and virtue they are transformed into a higher dignity than words can fully convey, or Acts of Parliament can confer ; and traditional loyalty, with a generous people, acquires the force (as Mr. Burke says) of a passion, and the warmth of personal attachment. But by those to whom we are attached, we are ready and prone to be, nay, we are already, influenced.”

This description refers chiefly to the social position and influence of the head of the State and makes no mention of his prerogatives such as the power of appointing and dismissing ministers, dissolving parliaments, giving or withholding assent to laws, pardoning crimes or abating punishment, not to

speak of the right of initiative in foreign politics which is out of place here. But what follows is still more to my point as it relates to the right of exercise of his power by the monarch directly over the *government of the country itself*:—

“He is entitled, on all subjects coming before the Ministry, to knowledge and opportunities of discussion, unlimited save by the iron necessities of business. Though decisions must ultimately conform to the sense of those who are to be responsible for them, yet their business is to inform and persuade the Sovereign, not to overrule him. Were it possible for him within the limits of human time and strength, to enter actively into all public transactions, he would be fully entitled to do so. What is actually submitted is supposed to be the most fruitful and important part, the cream of affairs. In the discussion of them, the monarch has more than one advantage over his advisers. He is permanent, they are fugitive; he speaks from the vantage ground of a station unapproachably higher; he takes a calm and leisurely survey, while they are worried with the preparatory stages, and their force is often impaired by the pressure of countless detail. He may be, therefore, a weighty factor in all deliberations of State. Every discovery of a blot that the studies of a sovereign in the domain of business enable him to make, strengthens his hands and enhances his authority. It is plain, then, that there is abundant scope for mental activity to be at work under the gorgeous robes of Royalty.”

If this is the case with the head of the Government of England, which, as already observed, is a limited monarchy almost bordering on a republic, in which the chief power is in the hands of the people, it is evident the widest constitution that an Indian Raja can give to his State must, from the very nature of the case, leave his autocracy untouched, except to a very small extent, and that extent will prove beneficial to himself and his house as much as to the people; while, on the other hand, a systematisation of the administration will ensure for his power or authority a degree of unfeigned respect and implicit obedience, which do not now characterise native rule generally

in the absence of all system. In fact the Raja will, for a long time to come, have to be his own king and parliament, ruler, supervisor, and critic, all in one, as also the sole source of the motive power which is to keep up the machinery of the administration going on steadily like time, tide and public life which wait for no man: for this purpose he must have special officers charged with the responsibility of taking care that no function gets into abeyance and no department goes to sleep over any portion of its duty; and in the discharge of the higher task of supervision he must to the utmost of his power and judgment gather about himself "men whose conduct is invariably regulated by private honour and public interest, and in whom the enthusiasm in the pursuit of national objects which seizes other men by fits and starts is constant and uniform." It should ever be borne in mind that the selection of proper agents is one great secret of successful administration.

This completes what may be called the official side of the constitution which is herein proposed, and it would be very desirable to supplement it by an outside or popular element which, under existing circumstances with any advantage to anybody and, indeed, with safety to the working of the public administration, can take the form only of a *Consultative Assembly* composed of the leading representatives of all the different interests and classes throughout each district or division of the State, moderate in numbers and meeting once a year at the capital on a fixed suitable day. Its functions should be to submit to the Government of the State any well-grounded representations it may wish to make on behalf of the people in regard to—

- (1) Any law which it may be proposed to enact;
- (2) Any new tax which it may be proposed to be levied;
- (3) Any items of revenue or expenditure of the State as entered in the estimates of the next year;
- (4) Any inconvenience which may have been occasioned, or believed to be caused, to the people by the working of any law or department of the State during the preceding year;

(5) Any general grievance or evil they may have suffered from or been subjected to during that period, or may apprehend in the next twelve month; and

(6) Any other suggestion which they may wish to make in regard to the public good.

And the Government, which must give to the deputies of the people sufficient time to frame their representations, must accord to them their attentive consideration and either accept, modify or reject the said representations and suggestions in whole or in part and assign reasons for their orders which, however, may be considered as final.

Some such plan as this would enable the people to take as much interest and part in the administration of the State as is demanded by their own welfare, and at the same time is consistent with its safety, and put upon their rulers as much sense of responsibility as is immediately necessary for the benefit of the commonwealth. More it is not feasible or wise to aim at just now lest the work of the administration should come to a deadlock. Further progress in that direction, therefore, will be possible only when the people are capable of realising the higher responsibilities of Government and ready and able to share in its labours, and that time is so distant that we need not trouble ourselves with a consideration of its requirements. It is, indeed, at all times well for the rulers and the ruled alike that as much of the detail of the administrative work, not only in the villages but even in the larger areas of the districts, should be carried on by and through the people themselves ; for it would serve to reduce to a minimum all friction and differences between the people and the officials as to facts of the first instance, simplify and facilitate the application of general principles and laws, and economise the expenditure of the public time, talent, and money, on the public business which, with every advance from autocratic simplicity, always has a tendency to an enormous increase and leads to over-work and delays and often under such pressure to perfunctory performance; but before even such a task can be transferred to them, the people must est-

abish their fitness and evince their desire for it by a successful and satisfactory discharge of their local and municipal functions in the villages and towns, a reference to which has already been made under the head of "district administration." Self-government to any extent or degree is no easy task, especially for a people disunited by race and caste, creed and tradition. These differences naturally tend to produce alienation of feelings and narrowness of views, and, as few public measures can affect or benefit all alike so as to obviate sectional jealousies and rivalries, there is always the fear of a conflict of opinions, prejudices, and interests proving inimical to the common cause. The main requisite of successful self-government (in the words of Lord Lansdowne who is reported to have used them as a friendly warning in his parting address as Viceroy of the Dominion of Canada, which is composed of a European population divided by race as well as by creed) is "a patriotic spirit strong enough not only to inspire men's tongues with patriotic utterances, and their minds with vague aspirations after national greatness, but strong enough to extinguish local jealousies, to efface the rivalries of race, of party, and of creed—strong enough to secure the subordination of sectional interests whenever the sacrifice is demanded in the interests of the nation—strong enough to enable the people to bear prosperity without intoxication and adversity with dignity and patience": and the spirit must be evinced instinctively as a settled principle of action and a deep-seated conviction of the public mind on every occasion calling for its exercise. It is only when thus moved that a community can efficiently manage its local affairs profitably co-operate with the Government. In the case in hand, as one means of enabling the people to qualify themselves for rendering such co-operation and for realising successfully even the small advance sketched out in these letters, education and enlightenment must be spread among them broadcast and deep. Men will then only learn to regard their own welfare as bound up with that of the State, they will only rise above and superior to their petty-selves, narrow views or class prejudices, and try to prove useful and loyal citizens when they are educated and enlightened and the

enabled to realise that each of them is a citizen and that as such he must sacrifice something for the public good. It is by awakening the mental and moral capacities of your subjects by means of a general diffusion of knowledge and of culture that you will be able to rouse the idea of true patriotism in your subjects so as to fit them for a proper exercise of their rights and a just discharge of their duties as the members of a commonwealth. This is a duty which primarily devolves on the State, though its full development depends on the leaders and instructors of society. The moral aspect of this important question has been dwelt on in my second letter; the secular will be discussed in the next. Yours &c.

A POLITICAL RECLUSE.

Letter No. XI.

MAHARAJA,

In the course of my third letter, I have pointed out the importance and necessity of the princes and nobles, and the higher orders generally, being brought up on a sound system of education so as to be enabled suitably to discharge the public duties of their high stations in life; and I reserved the question of popular instruction for future consideration: it is now time to address ourselves to the latter subject.

Ignorance is a curse and enlightenment a blessing in every rank and condition of life and of society. Hence the Government of a State, which wields its resources and shapes its destinies, is bound to provide for the enlightenment of its subjects by means of education. From a remote period, however, as observed in the letter referred to above, all knowledge and enlightenment were in this country held to be the exclusive privilege of a small class, and ignorance happened to be the portion of the multitude; but, as was also remarked in the same place, a very different order of things now obtains in

the land, and it not only permits but even demands as an essential for very existence a spread of education through all classes of the people. An exponent of the spirit of this new dispensation, an eminent member of one of the prominent British Universities, observes:—

“It would be of little avail to the peace and happiness of society, if the great truths of the material world were confined to the educated and the wise. The organization of science thus limited would cease to be a blessing. Knowledge secular, and knowledge divine, the double current of the intellectual life-blood of man, must not merely descend through the great arteries of the social frame, it must be taken up by the minutest capillaries before it can nourish and purify society. Knowledge is at once the manna and the medicine of our moral being. Where crime is the bane, knowledge is the antidote. Society may escape from the pestilence and may survive the famine; but the demon of ignorance, with his grim adjutants of vice and riot, will pursue her into her most peaceful haunts, destroying our institutions, and converting into a wilderness the paradise of social and domestic life. The State has, therefore, a great duty to perform. As it punishes crime, it is bound to prevent it. As it subjects us to laws, it must teach us to read them; and while it thus teaches, it must teach also the ennobling truths which display the power and the wisdom of the great Lawgiver, thus diffusing knowledge, while it is extending education; and thus making men contented, and happy, and humble, while it makes them quiet and obedient subjects.”

Popular education, therefore, must be taken in hand at the same time that the instruction of the higher classes is attended to; and it must be based on a compulsory system of primary education among the masses. For, if compulsory education has been found to be desirable or necessary for the general welfare in Europe and America, where the bulk of the people are so far advanced in knowledge, how much more is it not needed in this land of darkness where the unlettered and ignorant among the population including almost the whole of the female sex reckon at ninety five in every hundred, and entire classes present a total blank in intellectual enlightenment? Nor, do I believe, would there be any great difficulty experienced in introducing such a measure; for the generality of the people, though kept out of the reach of the light of knowledge, have always had a regard for the elements of learning and, if placed in the way, would welcome it as a boon for their children. There is only one condition which must be

observed, and that is *to offer it free of cost*: let free schools for primary education, therefore, be established in every town and village, and let them be thrown open to all, and attendance made compulsory on every male child of school-going age of the settled population, while periodic schools, similarly exempt from any charge, are opened for the children of *bona-fide* cultivators who cannot spare them from their work during their busy season. The fees in secondary schools, attendance at which may not be compulsory, should be of a very moderate character, so as to suit the means of even the poorest classes; and after this stage has been reached, that is, in high schools and collegiate institutions established and maintained by the State for imparting higher general, professional and technical education, the fees levied may have reference to the public expenditure incurred thereon. Mr. T. N. Mukherji, F. L. S., of the Indian Economic Museum, evinces a keen perception of the situation when, in addressing himself to the economical problem in British India, he suggests as the first step towards its solution the institution of—

“A mass education of a preliminary character just sufficient to prepare the way to dispel the darkness of the mind and to give it the power of sight to see the knowledge of the world; a technical education by which bread can be earned in humble life; and a higher education by which the intellect can press the modern sciences to the work of producing wealth on a large scale. Nothing is more important to the welfare of the country than primary education among the masses. It will break the present pride of education, and will prevent the severance of the educated from the plough and the chisel. It will bring better skill, greater thrift, more independence, and the power of a higher combination in the production of wealth. It will make them observe facts and phenomena which nature every day presents before their eyes, to put them together, to draw inferences from them, and to utilize them. What a vast field is this country to observe nature's phenomena with the light of modern knowledge, from the growth of a tiny plant to the brewing of a mighty storm, from her soft pleasing moods to her sulky caprices, to those mighty outbursts of her power which have ever brought mankind down upon its knees, to pray with clasped hands to the god of the firmament, the god of the wind, the god of the sun and the god of the sea. It will make our people better understand the teachings of the modern sciences, which at present they will fling away if not attended with immediate and palpable profit. Mass education is, therefore, the foundation on which to base all our work for the improvement of the condition of our people.”

These remarks are of equal applicability to all parts of the

country, and on this basis of the primary education of the masses must be raised the edifice of higher education in all branches of knowledge, theoretical and practical, through the Vernacular and English languages. It is not needful to go into any details regarding any scheme of this higher education for the Native States, as everybody is familiar with them from the institutions of British India and even from a few of their own; but in addition to the usual arrangements for imparting instruction, *some provision should be made*, and here private benefaction may well co-operate with the State, *for carrying on original research and investigation into the physical and moral sciences in their application to this country*. The necessity for such provision is indeed self-evident: without original researches and investigations all education must remain more or less a mechanical process, all knowledge, ancient or modern, inherited or acquired, a dead possession, unable to influence the national life materially, morally or socially below the surface or make any advance over what is taught and learnt at schools and colleges. Nor, lastly, must the sacred cause of female education be neglected. Free schools for the primary and secondary instruction of girls should be opened, and though attendance on their part may not be made compulsory, as in the case of the boys, much might be effected by rewards and encouragement, and the very creation of well-paid posts of female teachers throughout the State will act as a stimulus to its spread. Beyond this degree of progress, however, the developement of higher education among women must be influenced from above, that is, in other words, here you yourself and your higher classes must lead the way. Indeed, in this, as in all other questions connected with the social and moral condition of the people, Indian rulers have an immense advantage over the governors of British India, because they can directly lead Indian society, and mould its sentiments which the latter from the very fact of their being aliens are incapacitated from doing; and this advantage can, when the former are equal to their position and become alive to their duties, be utilised to set to British India that example in female culture, and refinement and in social progress generally, which has

heretofore been presented by it to the Native States chiefly in regard to the intellectual training of the men. National life must remain incomplete and at a low and unprogressive level where the females from want of education, a recognised position, or from any other cause, are incapable of sharing in the views or co-operating with the aims and objects of the males and family life is a one-sided assortment in which highly cultivated and liberally educated men are joined in wedlock with ignorant and superstitious women, who, however good and affectionate they may be, can never command from their spouses that innate and continued respect and regard which one cultured mind inevitably feels for another and which is essential to complete the union of hearts. Not only so, but in such circumstances even the knowledge and education which obtain among men will remain stationary or barren and incapable of creating an intellectual atmosphere. As has been well said, to educate a boy is only to bring up an individual, but to educate a girl is to train a whole family; and when with the aid of knowledge and experience gathered in the past the mothers of each generation begin to instruct their children from infancy, education in a community must improve rapidly in quality and extent; and with a progressive spirit of training and increasing knowledge society must advance in all other respects. Childhood is the most impressionable period of a man's life and during that period the mother constitutes to him not only the whole world but also his sole and infallible guide. The father's attentions are and ever will be momentary and superficial, and the importance of this function of the mother to the child's future cannot be over-estimated; for under her tender care and loving guidance his faculties can be awakened, principles and manners impressed and impulses aroused—and all this imperceptibly and unconsciously accomplished—with an efficaciousness which the deftest and most sympathetic pedagogue, philosopher or friend can never hope to bring about in after life. And it is thus that where women are educated and fitted (in the absence of education however only a very few souls who happen to be rarely gifted by nature can be fit) for the performance of this precious duty, in the case of almost every man who has

achieved something great or good in the world, the inspiration is traced to the mother's guidance during childhood, while the sympathy and co-operation of the wife is not less valuable. Female education and culture, therefore, are essential not only for the elevation of the sex and the felicity of domestic life but also for the proper training of children and the enlightenment and progress of society itself. The educated men of the day however, as a body, seem somehow disinclined to accept or act on this truth. I think here there is much need of a superior lead and example; but, situated as things are, the want can be supplied only by the Native Princes and Rulers. The only exception to the general disregard and distrust of female education is found in the case of that small section of the educated class which aspires after a higher ideal of religious, moral and social life not unknown in the past and that ideal necessarily implies the enlightenment of the female mind: but on the whole, it is to be feared, it will be long before this important desideratum among the essential elements of progress and advancement in India will be supplied.

I have said above that the whole cost of the primary instruction and the greater portion of that of secondary education of the males should be borne by the State, and that after that stage things should be left to take the usual course. An exception, for some time to come, must, however, be made in favour of what may correctly be called the backward classes, that is, classes who have remained ignorant and outside the pale of knowledge and enlightenment, not of their own accord or owing to any fault of theirs, but because of their compulsory exclusion from those advantages. These classes must, then, be helped and encouraged to emerge out of their condition of darkness and ignorance, and the wisest and fairest means of effecting the object would be to select the most promising of the boys belonging to those classes from each grade of schools for special rewards if they are well to do and support them entirely at the public expense, if they are poor, to prosecute their further studies in the lines most suited to their talents and natural bent of mind and thereby

enable them to attain to 'an equality of opportunity' and so to compete, as far as practicable, on equal terms with the rest of their brethren. No objection can, I think, be reasonably taken to such temporary help being given to the deserving children of the classes who are the producers of the wealth of the land, but who have been arbitrarily debarred from all access to culture and enlightenment exclusively enjoyed by those who live on the fruits of their labours. But it cannot be too emphatically stated that after they have been furnished with the requisite general knowledge, no specific line should be selected for them without any regard to their tastes and capacities but that they should be trained to that for which nature has endowed them with the best aptitude. It is only then that they will be able to do themselves and to society at large the good they are capable of. No small loss has been incurred and no little advantage foregone because of the failure to put to their appropriate uses talents and capacities with which nature is seen more or less indifferently to endow individuals among the different classes of a nation, and the natural fruitfulness of which therefore is sadly marred by 'a monotony and monopoly of occupation' artificially inflicted on their possessors from generation to generation. If any boy inherits a precious trade secret or capacity for his father's occupation, or at any rate has no special liking or aptitude for any other, by all means let him keep to it and make the best of his advantages ; but it will be found all the world over that it is natural talent and aptitude which have served to advance human arts, and these special talents and aptitudes are not always or universally hereditary ; what seems to be like it in many cases is the result of early training and association but when their object is not in unison with the natural bent of mind, its valuable power is wasted and this is what happens under the custom of hereditary occupation blindly followed. If arts in India once attained to a great excellence, it is not shown that it was due more to heredity of occupation than to natural genius. The reverse seems proved by general experience. It is undoubted that arts were cultivated in this country at an astonishingly early period, but at that time members of the same family appear to have

followed different pursuits and neither caste nor occupation was hereditary. The greatest advance again was made during the prevalence of Buddhism which put a scant value on the rules of caste or of descent in any line of life. On the other hand, the arts, instead of reaching perfection as they should have under the alleged virtue of heredity, have been stagnant if not retrogressive during the long succeeding centuries which have been characterised by an unmitigated supremacy of caste division and of exclusively hereditary occupation. Further, the social isolation which is the direct and natural offspring of these twin institutions has also in more recent times contributed powerfully to their decay by greatly facilitating the course of foreign competition. That decay is now the subject of general complaint and almost of pathetic lament as being the effect of the policy of a foreign government. But surely the destruction was not brought about in a day and fully to manifest itself it took well nigh a hundred years of British supremacy. It may, then, be asked where during all this time was all the desire and the enthusiasm to keep up the indigenous arts which now find such expression and why no effort was made to improve and support local industries so as to have enabled them to some extent at least to hold their own against foreign competition. Native society was surely wealthy and powerful and native rule extended over wide area enough to take care of native industries if they cared for them. But the truth is the artisans formed so distinct a community by themselves and had so little to do with the higher and governing classes that they might as well have lived in another country if not in another continent. Nor were their own faculties enlightened or views expanded by education to enable them to perceive their danger or prepare to resist it. When, therefore, foreign fabrics were brought into the country they were readily purchased to the exclusion of home manufactures by the cultured and consuming classes because of their comparative cheapness and this process went on without let or hindrance and the condition of the indigenous artisan proportionately deteriorated without its being much noticed. There was no sort of communion or sympathy between the manufacturing and con-

suming classes and thus the growing miseries of the former in no way affected or attracted the attention of the bulk of the latter because they were not connected by any social or family ties. Even now when the industrial collapse has been nearly complete and its economic effects on the general condition become so palpable, this state of things cannot be said to have *practically* altered. I will cite an anecdote or two in illustration. When some twenty years ago popular feeling on the subject was first excited and shops for the sale of locally made fabrics were opened, a middle class acquaintance was asked whether he was prepared to purchase from them in preference to any other. What object, said he enthusiastically, could be dearer than patronizing goods made in ones own country. But when he was told he would have to pay a little dearer for them, he quietly added—"ah ! in that case it is a matter for consideration." Much more recently, a gentleman of means, position and culture was declaiming against the policy of the Government which had ruined indigenous arts and manufactures and pleading before a company for their revival. One of the hearers however was curious to know how much of locally made wares and manufactures the speaker himself was consuming. But on scanning his dress from head to foot, from turban to shoe, it was found that every article was of foreign manufacture with the exception of the sacred thread he wore which probably cost two annas a year ! This was the magnificent extent of his patronage of local industries for the revival of which he vehemently pleaded. Was he then so silly or insincere in his profession ? No. He said and did what every one else was saying and doing, i. e. speaking from sentiment that did not reach home to him and hence the absence of serious or sustained practical effort in the matter : this is the natural result of the existing social and industrial arrangements. I am aware of the fact that the action of the Government in England was in the past directly hurtful and even now is not very friendly to Indian industries Nor am I here pleading for the policy of protection or against the right of every man or country to buy in the cheapest market. I am only showing how subtle and far reaching is the effect of the isolation produced by

caste and hereditary occupation but for which the once flourishing industries of India could have been helped to maintain themselves even against foreign competition at least to some extent by calling up the resources and talents which have lain dormant. The fact is a certain social solidarity and unity of interests is essential for a successful development of national industries as of all other sources of prosperity and greatness and to secure this development, talent and aptitude of all kinds wherever and in whomsoever they may be found to exist should be given a free scope instead of being thwarted or misdirected by artificial restrictions and checks on their exercise. For, other conditions being equal, they are the most potent factors of progress, and the cases of other countries of the world, from conservative China to radical America, prove clearly that not only in arts and manufactures, but in all lines of life natural talent and aptitude do more for human advancement and prosperity than heredity of occupation. Therefore, if arts and industries are to be developed,—and that they must be developed is one of the urgent needs of the times—natural talent must be utilised and improved by the best training which can be given on the spot or obtained in foreign countries where it is at its highest. The knowledge and skill thus acquired must be applied to the development of the resources of the State, whether agricultural, mineral, manufacturing, or artistic; and they must be directed towards the production of articles of such quality and at such cost that they shall be enabled to hold their own against outside competition. But your Court and your Administration must set the example of extending their patronage to them. Under such an impulse, the old arts and industries ought not only to preserve their special characteristics, but also to be able by comparison with foreign models even to strike out new styles of work and ornament, and thus add to their excellence and reputation. In the case of entirely new lines of business, however, the State, in the present want of knowledge and enterprise among its people, must also, cautiously and under well considered conditions, take some share of the initial risk. In these and in similar other ways must technical education and indus-

trial enterprise be made fruitful of good and a source of prosperity to the people and to the State. Of course, all these measures will require money, and money must be found for them, even if as a prudential investment in behalf of the commonwealth. This is why, among other reasons, no existing tax should be lightly given up. For it is from the taxes that the money which the State has to expend on these objects must come; and next to the preservation of the public peace and the maintenance of an efficient administration, the taxes cannot be applied to a more important purpose than in bringing about a development of its resources in all directions, material as well as moral, progress in both of which, indeed, must go together. The educational efforts of a State, then, ought not to end with schools and colleges, but they must run through other measures and institutions calculated to exert an educative and inspiring influence on the mass of its people generally, and stimulate their intelligence and industry. Museums, in which are gathered together for the inspection and edification even of the untravelled the distant products of skill and industry, might be established in suitable centres; exhibitions and shows held periodically at which the people would be able to realise how far their near and remote competitors fell short of or surpassed them in the production of superior goods and stock, and stimulated to attain facility and excellence therein; and special prizes might be offered and patents given for the introduction of new workmanship and industries, or for improvements in the methods of the old. These and other means, which ought to be adopted for unfolding the material side of the resources of the State, are well known from their success among Europeans and need not be dwelt upon here. I attach, however, still greater importance to what may be called the cultivation of the moral resources, that is giving a free scope and full encouragement to the development of the mental and moral capacities of man himself, because it is the unfolding of those capacities which forms man's crown on earth, which constitutes the real greatness of a people, and which is intimately connected even with material progress. Of this, too, we have examples in European

countries, but here I will refer to one nearer home—China. A mention of the name of that country in this connection will probably appear startling to some people; but I believe that a close and unprejudiced study of its institutions will discover much of order and constitution and sound social arrangements which certainly no other country in Asia is capable of showing and owing to which alone the celestial empire with its swarming population, its civilization, its laws, its literature, its science, its arts, its industries has steadily outlived its contemporaries of hoary antiquity and though approached and occasionally menaced by powerful rivals and neighbours from land and sea not only betrays no sign of decadence but on the contrary gives a promise that it means to turn its contact with the advanced West to its own advantage and strength, and European critics even regard it as the great power of the future. I think then that in spite of some of its barbarous customs and foolish prejudices including its contempt for the outside world (the knowledge and skill of which, however, with its wise instinct it has been slowly absorbing), it seems to me from the wise and liberal character of some of its political and social institutions, and still more its educational and industrial activity, to be, for the dormant and despotic East, a very advanced country. Its government is, no doubt, absolute in form and patriarchal in its executive methods but not, as generally held, quite arbitrary in practice. For, though the emperor is the sole interpreter of the decrees of Heaven, that august function is in truth sustained with the assistance of the sons of men; for His Majesty is helped by a Cabinet Council and Boards and Departmental Committees, which are presided over by the ablest and most experienced officers who are originally selected for the State service from among the youths of the empire by open competition, and which are the depositories of knowledge of all laws, and customs, and precedents and it is on these that the imperial behests and commands ultimately rest. Moreover, unlike any other Asiatic country, it has a public opinion expressed through printed placards and news letters by a section of the educated middle class known as the “literary and gentry” who stand midway between a vast body of interested

officials on the one hand, and the mass of the people on the other. This middle class consists of those who have been admitted to a government examination, but who have not succeeded in being of the select number to whom degrees are granted. They exercise a salutary and, within limits, a powerful influence." Archdeacon Gray from whose History of the laws, manners, and customs of China I am quoting, adduces the following testimony of an American consular officer regarding the position and functions of the class referred to (Vol. I page 182) :—

"They act" writes Mr. Low from the United States Legation at Pekin, in an official letter (January, 1871) to his Government, "as advisers to the lower classes, and their good offices are sought by the governing class in the management of local concerns. By their superior intelligence they are enabled to control most of the property and yet few acquire such wealth as would enable them to oppress the people were they so disposed.

"This class create the public opinion of the country, which exercises a controlling influence over the officials, and is usually powerful enough to thwart the intentions and nullify the action of the officers, from the Emperor down, whenever popular rights are in danger of being invaded or the people unduly oppressed. So powerful is the influence of the *literati* that all officials endeavour to conform their action to the popular will, and in this view the Government of China is essentially democratic in practice."

This compliment coming from the representative of a pronounced republic of the West must be considered significant and is doubtless deserved. Indeed, the Chinese constitution may well be regarded as liberal since the Emperor has the right to select a competent outsider to succeed him, if there should be no member of his family qualified to rule. This right is, of course, scarcely ever exercised, but the provision shows much regard for the claims of the subjects to good government. Again, His Majesty is regarded as the child of the Sun ; but he does not seek his domestic alliances among other children of the sun or the moon, but selects even his Empress, the sharer of his exalted position, from among the marriageable daughters of his subjects on account of their personal qualities and attractions without reference to their families and positions ; for there are no distinctions of caste among the people ; titles of honor and degrees of nobility are not permanent but limited to certain generations proportioned to the degree of the founder's merit ; and even the Imperial blood is dis-

-tantly absorbed into the body politic. Education is universal among men, and general among women ; humane institutions, like asylums for the blind, the leper, the infirm, the foundling, &c., are not wanting ; but I need not go into these details regarding the celestials. I have made this brief allusion to the general character of the political and social institutions of the country only to show there is an example of some sort of impersonal order and constitution even in Asia. My chief object here, however, is to draw attention to the means which the State among that conservative people uses to draw out the intellectual and moral capacities of the nation. The public service, for instance, is recruited by free competition from among all classes without restriction, and Carlyle, who was chary of bestowing praise where not much was deserved, thus descants on this particular measure :—

“By far the most interesting fact I hear about the Chinese is one on which we cannot arrive at clearness, but which excites endless curiosity even in the dim state : this namely, that they do attempt to make their Men of Letters their Governors ! It would be rash to say, one understood how this was done, or with what degree of success it was done. All such things must be very *unsucessful* ; yet a small degree of success is precious ; the very attempt how precious ! There does seem to be, all over China, a more or less active search everywhere to discover the men of talent that grow up in the young generation. Schools there are for every one : a foolish sort of training, yet still a sort. The youths who distinguish themselves in the lower school are promoted into favourable stations in the higher, that they may still more distinguish themselves,—forward and forward : it appears to be out of these that the Official Persons, and incipient Governors, are taken. These are they whom they *try* first, whether they can govern or not. And surely with the best hope : for they are the men that have already shown intellect. Try them : they have not governed or administered as yet ; perhaps they cannot ; but there is no doubt they *have* some understanding,—without which no man can ! Neither is Understanding a *tool*, as we are too apt to figure ; ‘it is a *hand* which can handle any tool.’ Try these men : they are of all others the best worth trying. Surely there is no kind of government, constitution, revolution, social apparatus or arrangement, that I know of in this world, so promising to one’s scientific curiosity as this. The man of intellect at the top of affairs : this is the aim of all constitutions and revolutions, if they have any aim. For the man of true intellect, as I assert and believe always, is the noble hearted man withal, the true, just, humane and valiant man. Get *him* for governor, all is got ; fail to get him, though you had Constitutions plentiful as blackberries, and a Parliament in every village, there is nothing yet got !” (Lectures on Heroes, No V.)

This one institution alone cannot but prove a mighty stimulus

to national education and enlightenment, and the historian accordingly observes that there is perhaps no country in the world "in which education—up to a certain point—is more generally diffused among the male population." I am tempted here to quote, as an illustration of the manner in which it is calculated to work on the public mind, the following account from Mr. Gray's book (pp. 176–77) of the treatment of graduates passing the highest test of knowledge and capacity :—

"The examination for the degree of Han-lin or LL. D. is conducted in the Imperial Palace at Peking by the Emperor himself. The test is a written answer to any question which the Emperor may propose. The successful candidates are divided into four classes. Those of the first class have the degree conferred on them, and are reserved for important vacancies. Graduates of the second class become members of the inner council; those of the third class obtain situations in the six boards, and those of the fourth become district rulers. The newly-made Han-lins are entertained at dinner by the Emperor, and, as a mark of great honour, each guest sits at a separate table, upon which the most *recherché* viands are spread. The graduate at the head of the list is called Chwan-yuen, and his reputation extends to all parts of the empire. Wandering heralds carry his name to remote villages as well as populous towns, and both high and low make a point of becoming acquainted with some particulars of his family and early training. When he travels, the keepers of the various hostleries at which he lodges consider themselves highly honoured by the presence of so distinguished a visitor. In 1872, Canton had the honour of Chwang-yuen, and the most distinguished of the Han-lins for that year entered the city in state. The Han-lin Hall, in which the degree of Doctor of Laws is conferred, is in the form of a parallelogram, and on each of the four sides there is a cloister. Against the walls of the cloisters are placed marble slabs on which are inscribed the original text of Confucius. In the centre, under a pavilion, is the throne on which the Emperor sits when called upon, in the discharge of his imperial duties, to explain the doctrines of Confucius to his ministers. When the degree of Doctor of Laws is conferred, the approved candidates arrange themselves round the throne, and as the name of each candidate is called, the Emperor makes a mark against it with his vermilion pencil in a list which he has before him."

And yet the young scholars thus honoured and advanced may be the humblest in birth and position among their countrymen. Then again the State marks with the stamp of its approval a high proficiency in knowledge and bestows social distinctions on its possessors at any stage and in any condition of life, and men of sixty appear at examinations for degrees as eagerly as any youth. Similarly are rewarded distinguished public services and

uncommon degrees of virtue exhibited both in public and private, including instances of exceptional filial devotion and even the attainment to a very old age! How much sound sense and philosophy is there in this last ordinance! For a green old age is, as a rule, only the result of a virtuously spent youth and manhood and a public sentiment which regards such a life and such old age as in themselves worthy of respect cannot but prove salutary in its effect on the national mind and morals.

Now, all this is intended to lead to the suggestion that you should institute orders of distinction within your own dominions for the public recognition of worth and the reward of merit among your own subjects. The love of honour and distinction in the eyes of our fellow men is strong in the human breast, and it is wise and just to gratify it when deserved through exemplary behaviour. The individual, indeed, must pursue right and duty for their own sake; but the State cannot be doing wrong in putting its own value on such a pursuit, and thus using it as a means for raising the moral tone and promoting the happiness of the community; nay, it is its duty not to neglect those means which have been placed at its disposal to that end. There should, then, be established orders to distinguish all kinds of public services and personal merits and virtues throughout the State. Exceptional fidelity to trust in the presence of great temptation, originality in literature and science, inventiveness in art or manufacture, courage and intrepidity in saving human life, self-sacrificing exertions in relieving human suffering, munificence and liberality directed to the advancement of the general welfare, disinterested devotion to and pursuit of the public good—signal examples of these and similar other virtues and also extraordinary examples of devotion to duty and tenderness shown even in humble private life under trying conditions and circumstances should be formally recognized by the State and honoured with suitable distinctions according to their degrees of merit, from rewards and titles to mere mentions with approbation in the *State Gazette*, which, when judiciously and impartially bestowed, cannot fail to be appreciated and prized. The holders of these distinctions will then go to form a veritable “Legion of Honor”; they

would constitute the true nobility of nature and the aristocracy of intellect among the people and vying with the men of birth, wealth, and position, would imperceptibly contribute to the elevation and advancement of society. Of course the Raja must be the head and patron of all the orders, because he is the representative of the State and as such the fountain source of all honour and authority proceeding from it, and from this double position duly sustained it must follow that your court will be the cherished home of those beneficent agencies and influences appertaining to times past and to times present which make for the improvement of man's condition in this world and fit him for a better—a source of pride and hope to your people and of envy and example to your neighbours.

I believe, Maharaja, you will now perhaps realize the full force of the observation which has been previously made to the effect that the reforms I have recommended in the constitution and in the administration of your State are calculated not to diminish but rather to strengthen and enhance your power and dignity. I have yet one more letter to address you before I shall have done. Yours &c.

A POLITICAL RECLUSE.

Letter No. XII.

MAHARAJA,

You are now placed, under the scheme developed in these letters, at the head of a constitutionalised government and at the top of a society endowed with two of the essential elements of progress, *viz.*, education or the means of attaining knowledge and enlightenment, and freedom or full scope for the development of its genius and its resources. I think you will find, as remarked at the close of my last letter, that this new position, so far from detracting from your authority and prestige, as compared with the old precarious order of things, will only add to them, and very justly too, because it imposes on you strenuous duties and weighty functions, the fulfilment of which necessarily constitutes moral force; and it is moral

force which, on a large view of things, will be found to prevail in and rule the world.

There is yet one more of these duties and functions which is as essential as the rest that have been already described, but it is by no means as onerous as most of them, *viz.*, the duty, in one word, of keeping complete touch with the country. You must be "a man of your time accessible to ideas, well aware of what goes on in spheres very unlike his own." To sustain this position you must on occasions travel out of your State privately and, if possible, even *incognito*, in which case you will be not only spared the time and trouble spent in formalities but also be able intimately to know the land through which you pass and the real sentiments of its people. It is, however, with reference to your own State that this duty has an especial claim on your attention. A personal acquaintance with the different portions of his dominions and a correct insight into the character, condition, and the wants and wishes of the people are essential in a ruler for success in his work. Not to speak of any higher object, it will enable him quickly to comprehend and correctly to appreciate whatever official papers and information will come before him for disposal in the course of business. So, to acquire such acquaintance and insight into your own State, you must make periodic tours through your territories. These tours, entered upon with no larger retinue than is absolutely necessary so as to involve no heavy expense and also to make the smallest possible demand on local resources, may be undertaken at convenient times and seasons, but they must be so regulated that no part of the State, however humble or remote from your headquarters, may remain unvisited for any very long interval, while special occasions might require special visits to particular localities. This duty would be far from unpleasant. Change of scene and climate is always agreeable; and it often becomes necessary for the restoration of health and energy to an over-worked constitution. Indeed, Nature, who is a teacher and a nurse herself, suggests this idea of change and through her wondrous succession of seasons kindly furnishes it even to those who remain rooted to one spot. An occasional peep into the simplicity of village life, the quietude of rural existence and the

stillness, grandeur and sublimity of Nature may, therefore, pleausurably alternate with the splendour of palaces and the crowds, the din and the business of capital cities and towns, and tend to increased zest for work and enjoyment just as the tamarind fruit or mango pickle occasionally tasted restores the relish of one satiated with indulgence in sweet-meats. An ancient European poet has, perhaps with a touch of envy, put the same truth in this form:—

“ Sometimes ’tis grateful to the rich to try,
A short vicissitude, and fit of poverty.
A savoury dish, a homely treat,
Where all is plain, where all is neat,
Without the stately spacious room,
The Persian carpet or the Tyrian loom,
Clear up the cloudy foreheads of the great.”

Now this renovation of strength is not a small gain to be derived from tours in the country. The places visited, too, will not be without a reciprocal benefit; their denizens will naturally feel honoured and welcome you with preparations which would incidentally effect the removal of some local discomforts, *e. g.* a broken road; while your presence among them might well encourage them with your aid to provide some public want, a tank, a school-house, a dharamashala and so forth and thus these visits would leave beneficent mementoes behind them. But, of course, their main purpose is for you to know the country and to be known by it, to acquire a living knowledge of the people, their condition, sentiments, and feelings, which must be obtained by a free intercourse with them and by an interchange of thoughts and of hospitalities. A short converse with a plain villager or an unsophisticated rustic casually met, too, will often prove more instructive for the purpose in hand than a formal interview with a professedly representative man. While, however, you thus freely mix socially with the people, you must guard against being officially inaccessible to those who would seek you on business. To this point I have briefly alluded in my opening letter, and I must say a few words here in explanation of it. Accessibility is a characteristic virtue of personal rule, and must not be abandoned where the administration is systematized, but it must be judiciously utilized to test its work-

ing, and, where possible, to supplement its defects or shortcomings. You have probably heard of the Emperor Akbar's bell-court, *i. e.*, a chamber attached to the palace in which there hung a bell. Any subject, who wished to relate the story of his grievance to His Majesty in secret, had only to ring this bell and the Emperor stood before him alone ready to listen. This contrivance, it is said, inspired the imperial officials with a wholesome fear of their responsibility, and the people ceased to suffer from any oppression. The story is popularly related and, whether true or not historically, it conveys a moral which is worth bearing in mind though, no doubt, secret methods of this kind are from their very nature almost certain to lead to demoralization on both sides, and should therefore be resorted to only in special cases. But you must be accessible in a business-like manner, and for this purpose what I would suggest is that whenever you are on a visit to a place, you must set apart some time, and, while in the capital, a fixed day in the month, when any subject might freely call on and lay before you a personal or general grievance for which no remedy has been provided, and you may take such action thereon as may seem to be called for. Of course, such cases ought to be very few, because they are not to include matters which have been decided by duly constituted judicial or executive authority and by yourself in appeal, and people who are once found to make a frivolous use of the privilege may be deprived of it altogether. Limited by these conditions, your personal accessibility to your subjects will, I believe, be free from objection or embarrassment of any kind. It may, on the contrary, serve to bring to your notice exceptional cases and interesting incidents such as you could come across only if you were yourself moving among them in disguise, and it seems well calculated not only to remove all reasonable ground of complaint but even to produce a feeling of confidence and general satisfaction among the people at large. With a mind thus kept awake by personal intercourse and instructed by official information, you will be able to "survey society and the administration from top to bottom, and examine the interior forces by which they are kept at once in balance and in motion": and from your vantage ground you will be able to detect and remove any danger to the public

interests ; find out and redress individual wrongs or injustice ; and alleviate distress and suffering which might otherwise afflict their victims in hopeless despair. In some cases, a mere word of explanation, sympathy, or encouragement would be enough to soothe heart-burnings ; in others official inquiry and action might be called for or an exercise of your prerogative necessary to heal a wound otherwise irremediable ; and in others still the judicious bestowal of a little “secret service money”—it would really deserve to be styled sacred service money and should yearly find a place as discretionary allowance among the heads of the State Budget—would remove some unmerited privation, hardship or suffering. Through continued ministrations of this kind you will be able to diffuse happiness and contentment through out the State, and be justly regarded as, in the best sense of the expression, the father of your people ; creating a noble tradition in your family ; supplying worthy precedents for the guidance of your successors ; affording a bright example to your brother rulers ; furnishing material for many a tale and panegyric to be handed down from generation to generation of your subjects ; and thus bringing vividly to men’s minds a felicitous combination of the poet’s ideal of the king in the East—

“Here reigned a king who walked in Virtue’s path,
Who ruled his country only for his God.
His people’s good he deemed his only care,
Their sorrows were his sorrows, and their joys
He counted as his own ; such was the king
Whose daily prayers went up to Him on high
For wisdom and for strength to rule his men
Aright, and guard the land from foreign foes—”

with that of him in the West—

“We see him as he moved,
How modest, kindly, all-accomplished, wise,
With what sublime repression of himself
And in what limits, and how tenderly ;
Not swaying to this faction or to that ;
Not making his high place the lawless perch
Of wing’d ambitions, nor a vantage-ground
For pleasure ; but thro’ all this tract of years
Wearing the white flower of a blameless life,
Before a thousand peering littlenesses,
In that fierce light which beats upon a throne,
And blackens every blot.”

Here my task may be said to end ; but just as I began, so do I wish to conclude these letters with answering a few questions.

And the first question which occurs is—Why should you impose on yourself the troublesome task of reform and innovation when an indolent continuance of the existing order of things is possible ? I have already made an answer to this question before, but it will well bear a little variation. Every man and every enlightened man who recognises the dignity of his nature must regard it as his duty and his privilege humbly to strive his best in the sphere in which he is placed to leave the world better than he found it. For a ruler, especially one who is gifted and enlightened, this conception of his position opens out no end of reform and improvement in the administration on which depend the happiness and welfare of millions of human beings and of generations yet unborn and hence the more permanent the seeds of reform the greater is the value and fruitfulness of the achievement. There is, besides, a very old precept or precedent for the kind of reform herein urged. The idea of the will of a sovereign being limited by the dictates of right and wrong, and controlled and guided by the advice and experience of responsible ministers, spiritual and temporal, as also influenced by the voice of representatives of the people, appertains to very ancient times in this land ; but it has become quite obsolete by the later prevalence of absolute despotism, under which the king owns no law but his will. Even then, however, an ideal monarch is universally held to be he who personally goes about, often in disguise, to find out the wrongs of his people and afford instant redress. It is thus that the names of Rajas Vikram and Bhoj among Hindus, and of Khalifs Harun Al-rasjid and Al-Mahmun among the Mahomedans, have become famous and typical of good sovereigns, and their successors are esteemed only in proportion to the degree to which they follow their example. But an individual ruler, whatever his energy and intelligence, is not ubiquitous, nor possessed of the faculty of perceiving what is not immediately before his eyes or within his hearing. What is thus impossible to the individual, however, is rendered feasible by systematic or constitutional

government, which may be likened to a net of feelers conveying to the centre knowledge of things remote as well as near. Again, despotic rule, which is injurious to the interests of the subject, is no more favourable to the steady fortunes of the State nor of the reigning dynasty. It is a historical truth that under such rule the State rises or falls both in reputation and prosperity according to the personal character of the ruler, and personal character is not only uncertain but more often than not falls short of the requisite standard. Therefore it is that Colonel Todd, in recounting with the fullest sympathy the results of the best type of indigenous rule India presented in the stirring story of Rajputana in general, and of Mewar, its premier State in particular, in which etiquette, custom and observance approached the dignity but fell far short of the substance of a constitution, is obliged to exclaim :—"Happy the country where the sovereignty is in the laws, and where the monarch is but the chief magistrate of the State unsubjected to those vicissitudes, which make the sceptre in Asia unstable as a pendulum, kept in perpetual oscillation by the individual passions of her princes ; where the virtues of one will exalt her to the summit of prosperity as the vices of a successor will plunge her into the abyss of degradation." This is a brief but suggestive observation and it holds good of all States in all conditions and circumstances.

Now, I conceive that, to aspire after such a model, the Native States in India are or ought to be powerfully propelled from three different directions at the present time. In days gone by, they had to hold their own in war or diplomacy against encroaching neighbours, and this condition kept up their energies, though in a rude form ; but protection being now ensured by the British Government, the resulting repose and security is calculated to lead to degeneracy of spirit and body, unless a higher responsibility is created in the conduct of their internal affairs to which they are now confined. This can only be secured by the adoption of constitutional methods of administration which bring out mental powers and moral vigour and keep them in salutary play, while they serve to advance and safeguard good government. Again, every day the intercourse between

British India and Native Territory is developing, and as the reign of law and rights of citizenship ripen in the former, its people will be impelled to cry out against a continuance of patriarchal rule in the latter and invoke the interference of the Paramount Power to force reform on it. Fortunately for you and your brethren, however, educated British India is not in a hurry to march socially and morally to the requisite standard : if any thing it shows signs of being quite restive if not reactionary in regard to those vital questions and evinces a desire to cherish rather than reform or correct a state of society that is based on or favourable to abuses and wrongs and penetrated with baneful influences in itself as much as it is inconsistent with the growth or existence of citizenship or national progress in any direction whatever. If, meanwhile, the Native States choose to act voluntarily, they have the means not only of marching alongside British India, but even going ahead of it in some important respects and furnishing an example to it. But, lastly, there is the huge car of the Government of India itself treading heavily onwards with its wheels within wheels and its many and diverse conductors, all co-operating with each other, no one thwarting another, and turning even their mistakes to its own aggrandisement. In these circumstances woe to the State which throws itself in its path, or rather does not keep itself out of its way.

All these, then, are powerful motives for the Indian Princes not only to put their existing administrations on their best behaviour, but also to improve the very system, so as to ensure continued good government for the future amidst all individual changes. And this remark leads to the next question which might occur—Is the course herein recommended practicable? I cannot see why it should not be. I do not suggest the promulgation of a complex constitution which could not without difficulty be carried out in practice, and may only prove bewildering to the people. What has to be done is that with the aid of proper instruments carefully chosen and all wilful obstruction sternly repressed the requisite measures be taken in hand one after another in the order of their importance and urgency, and set agoing, and

there is little doubt that if this is done the outlines of a system will have been laid out in a few years. This is what was done and is still being done in India by the British Government itself, and there is no reason why what they find practicable over a large extent of territory and among diverse masses of people varying in race, custom, creed and intelligence, should not be feasible in the small areas and comparatively homogeneous populations of the Native States—with earnestness of purpose, with intelligence and vigilant supervision. Again, will it be acceptable to the subjects? There can be no question on that head, too. No one likes to be arbitrarily governed, and all would welcome right and liberty. The only question may be whether, so long accustomed to despotic sway, they would have the courage and public spirit to assert their rights as against local hierarchies. But in this they only differ from the subjects of British India in degree, and, indeed, have some advantages over the latter as has been explained in the letters on District Administration. In both alike the supervising authorities have need, in order to help their subjects in the realization of their boons, to be ever watchful and to allow no judicial ignorance to prevent their inquiring into abuses known to exist. In China, it is said, this duty is assigned to a special board—not a bad idea. But, once again and for the last time, it may be asked—Can the system thus commenced be expected to flourish in safety? May it not be thwarted, if not upset, by inimical cabals or influences or by a successor who may be differently inclined? This is not very likely. The moral force of public opinion generally would be opposed to such a retrogression and the paramount power may be expected to throw in its weight on the side of that opinion; but I confess a really reliable guarantee would be furnished only by the Political Agents of the British Government at the Native Courts being held answerable for their good administration along with the Princes themselves. At present, these able officers, besides watching the interests of their own Government, have mainly to perform the duties, as it were, of surveillance and to make reports, which at the critical stage cannot be considered as other than one-sided, on the faults and failings

of the Princes ; but such a modification in their position as that suggested would render their services far more prolific of good to the Native States and to the British Government. A quarter of a century ago, the then Secretary of State for India ordered an inquiry into the relative merits of English and Native rule in this country, and a leading London critic noticing the subject held it proved that England had pressed out all vital energies from the Native States. That was as inevitable as it was true, for the States used to spend their energies more on fighting with their neighbours and rivals, including the British power, than on their own affairs, and peace was uncertain in that condition of things. But now from rivals they have become subordinate and protected allies. Therefore, the same far-sighted policy, which then neutralised their energy, now demands that it be restored and sustained for work within their own bounds. This can only be compassed by altering the relations of the political officers to the States as already indicated. The change would be just and beneficial to the States, and would not be without some direct gain even to the British Government itself. It would for one thing remove all cause of distrust or anxiety on either side and all feeling of irritation and friction between them, and this by itself would not be a small advantage; but there is yet another no less important. The British Empire in Asia has become unwieldy and is still growing. Its Government has already invited or welcomed offers of military aid and co-operation from the Indian Princes in the external defence of that empire, and its responsible rulers declare the burden of governing it to be heavy, indeed, and would gladly share it with Native potentates. There is no reason to doubt the sincerity of that declaration, for the task of governing a fifth of the human race, aliens in blood, language, creed and thought, and that too from a base 5000 miles away cannot be an easy one ; but on the ordinary ground of human nature it strikes me that so long as their present unsound political relations exist, or, in other words, so long as the fate of a prince practically rests in the hands of a single political officer, *i. e.*, is decided in accordance with his report—and the Government of India and the Secretary of State as his im-

mediate official superiors are too much identified with him and with the general tenor of his official acts not to accept or act on his views in any dispute between the two parties—no co-operation between them can be ungrudging and salutary in its consequences, though it may be rendered by the weaker merely because withholding it would displease the stronger side. All this would change if the Indian Princes could feel that the responsibility of the Political Officers towards the good government of their territories lay actively and formally on the same side with their own, and that in case of any serious differences between them they would be judged by an independent and impartial tribunal. No other course seems so well calculated to inspire them with a sense of security for their position and with self-respect, self-possession and courage to undertake a difficult and onerous task, and yet this attitude of the mind is essential to enable them to deal with the standing obstacles and vested interests in the way of all reform and change and to their efficiency as rulers of their own territories and also as friends of the British Government in any matter in which their help and counsel might be sought or be useful. I have referred to this point once more, because, as I have observed in speaking of it in its proper place before, to my mind it covers more than half the problem in hand, and without a satisfactory settlement of the former the solution of the latter would be extremely difficult, if not impossible. If any proof of this view be wanted, it is abundantly supplied by the fact that almost* all instances in which any reform or system has been

* An exception must be made in justice to the memory of a very interesting and singular character, the late Anandashram Swami. He was an educated and intelligent Bengali gentleman, who having entered the Sanyast order betook as required by its rules to travel away from the province of his birth, and passing through Northern and Central India about a quarter of a century ago reached one of the leading States of Kathiawar. Here he saw instances of misrule and exposed them in newsletters to a paper published in Bombay. Their appearance attracted attention and produced excitement and curiosity in the State as it was not easy in those days to find in so remote a quarter a man who knew and could write English. The author, however, was soon found out and taken before the Raja who remonstrated with him on his conduct; but the Swami persisted and when threatened with the jail—for he was too sacred a person to be given any violent punishment—

adopted in any of the Native States have occurred through the British Government intervening, whether on account of the minority of their rulers or from any other cause, and either directly administering their possessions or lending their full support to the ministers by whom the changes in question were introduced.

he declared that as he had given up home and family, the jail to him was as good a place of residence as any other and that so long as he saw oppression practised on the people he would continue exposing it, whatever the consequences to him personally. This exhibition of disinterestedness melted the heart of the old Rajput ruler of the State and he offered the Swami the post of his Divan that he might manage things as he thought best. The latter however pointed to his cloth as forbidding his re-entrance into worldly occupation but undertook to procure a competent man for the office, and an educated gentleman from Bombay was induced by the Swami to accept it. The new regime introduced reforms in the judicial system and began the practice of passing decisions in the chief judicial court irrespective of frowns and favors from persons in authority and unbiassed by other personal considerations. It also influenced reforms in departments other than the judicial and partially though indirectly helped on the abolition of the farming system which was a source of much abuse. These arrangements gave satisfaction to the people and the name and fame of the Swami spread throughout the Province. The anti-reform party in the State however could not brook the new order of things and after incessant intrigue and misrepresentations succeeded in undermining his influence and procuring the dismissal of his nominee. But though the men were changed the reforms they had introduced not only remained in tact but were gradually adopted by the other States in the Province. Neither did the old party regain the uninterrupted lease of power it had enjoyed before nor the same degree of it. Now this case is an exception to the rule mentioned in the text as the specific reforms referred to were brought about solely by the exertions of the Swami and in no way were prompted or helped by the British Government or its Political Agent. Of course their influence always works on the side of improved administration and it was so working even at this time in the Province generally; but in the particular case here mentioned the Political Agent so far from seconding the Swami for a time even looked upon him with some suspicion because it was unusual to find a man who put on the yellow garb of the orthodox hermit and conformed to orthodox ways of life and yet read and spoke English and concerned himself with politics and the worldly welfare of his fellowmen. Hence the Swami received from the Agency officials the soubriquet of "A Political Sanyasi." His I believe has been the only instance of its kind. However it shows that it is possible to find even an Indian Raja willing to reform his administration in the interests of his subjects but that as in the case of despotic rulers all the world over he must be surrounded always with favourable influences. But what influence could be more favorable for this purpose and what more permanent than that of the Political Agent if he be held responsible conjointly with his charge for good government?

I have done. I have only to add that I do not claim to have said in these letters anything that is very deep or new. As I have confessed at the outset, the reforms herein urged were either suggested by others or are such as might occur to any body who would care to think on the matter : I have only brought them together in a convenient shape. Some of them, too, have already been adopted more or less completely in some of the States, including your own, and others in some others : but I believe in no State have all of them been carried out, and there are many in which little or nothing of this kind has been done. I, therefore, sincerely trust that these letters will prove of interest to many in and out of Native States, and I earnestly pray that any effort which you or any one else should be inclined to make to give effect to any of the suggestions they contain may be crowned with success.

Finally, esteemed Maharaja, I wish you God's choicest blessings, health and longevity, success and prosperity ; and, hoping that you may deserve the name and fame of a model Ruler and an exemplary Prince, I beg to take my leave of you and ever to remain—

Your Highness' earnest well-wisher,

A POLITICAL RECLUSE.